

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO



3 1822 00282 0538

LEADERS of the CHURCH

1800

JOHN
KEBLE

1900



EDWARD F. L. WOOD



In grateful remembrance
of a
"Quiet Day"
in S. Katharine's College
Chapel, Tottonham.
Feb. 17th 1910.

419687

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA

LEADERS OF THE CHURCH
1800—1900

EDITED BY

GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL

UNIFORM WITH THIS VOLUME

3/6 net.

DEAN CHURCH.

By D. C. Lathbury.

BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

By R. G. Wilberforce.

DR. LIDDON.

By G. W. E. Russell.

BISHOP WESTCOTT.

By Joseph Clayton.

DR. PUSEY.

By G. W. E. Russell.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.

By C. F. G. Masterman.

MR. GLADSTONE.

By D. C. Lathbury.



John Kible

LEADERS OF THE CHURCH

1800—1900

EDITED BY GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL

JOHN KEBLE

BY THE

HON. EDWARD F. L. WOOD, M.A.

Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford



A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.

LONDON : 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.

OXFORD : 9 High Street

First impression, 1909

TO
MY FATHER

GENERAL PREFACE

IT seems expedient that the origin and scope of this new Series of Biographies should be briefly explained.

Messrs. A. R. Mowbray and Co. had formed the opinion that Ecclesiastical Biography is apt to lose in attractiveness and interest, by reason of the technical and professional spirit in which it is generally handled. Acting on this opinion, they resolved to publish some short Lives of "Leaders of the Modern Church," written exclusively by laymen. They conceived that a certain freshness might thus be imparted to subjects already more or less familiar, and that a class of readers, who are repelled by the details of ecclesiasticism, might be attracted by a more human, and in some sense a more secular, treatment of religious lives.

This conception of Ecclesiastical Biography agreed entirely with my own prepossessions; and I gladly acceded to the publishers' request that I would undertake the general superintendence of the series. I am not without the hope that these handy and readable books may be of some service to the English clergy. They set forth the impressions produced on

the minds of devout and interested lay-people by the characters and careers of some great ecclesiastics. It seems possible that a knowledge of those impressions may stimulate and encourage that "interest in public affairs, in the politics and welfare of the country," and in "the civil life of the people," which Cardinal Manning noted as the peculiar virtue of the English Priesthood; and the lack of which he deplored as one of the chief defects of the Priesthood over which he himself presided.¹

G. W. E. RUSSELL.

S. Mary Magdalene's Day,
1905.

¹ See "Hindrances to the Spread of the Catholic Church in England," at the end of Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*.

PREFACE

THE preparation of another Life of Mr. Keble, following so soon upon the able discharge of a similar task by Dr. Lock, the present Warden of Keble College, Oxford, might seem to demand a word of explanation. It is not claimed to have contributed much that is original to the existing knowledge of the subject, drawn as it is from sources to which already for the most part the enquirer has had privilege of access. But it was obvious that no series could adequately represent the history of the English Church in the nineteenth century through the lives of the Church's leaders in that period, without the inclusion of Mr. Keble's name.

With the object of meeting this requirement the present work was undertaken, in the full knowledge that, for those acquainted with the history of these years, it was only possible to sketch once more a narrative, in the main sufficiently familiar even to the general reader.

My gratitude is due to many relations and friends of Mr. Keble for their courtesy in placing papers and information at my service,

which have been of the greatest help. To them, and to others who have so readily assisted with suggestion and advice, I must express regret that pressure of time should have prevented me from turning their kindness to more satisfactory account.

EDWARD F. L. WOOD.

September, 1909.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	EARLY YEARS - - - - -	I
II.	THE MOVEMENT - - - - -	23
III.	DIVERGENCE - - - - -	49
IV.	THE POET - - - - -	97
V.	CHURCH AND STATE - - - - -	119
VI.	GUIDE, PHILOSOPHER, AND FRIEND - - -	151
VII.	THE PARISH PRIEST - - - - -	177
VIII.	CONCLUSION - - - - -	200

Leaders of the Church

1800—1900



JOHN KEBLE

CHAPTER I

EARLY YEARS

THE interest that attaches to the early years of those whom after-life makes famous has, in the case of Mr. Keble, something more than ordinary significance.

The value of the work of his life lies largely in the fact that it was a natural and almost inevitable outcome of his early training. The place, moreover, that he was to fill in the statement of principle, and the translation of principle into action, was one that was peculiar to him as compared with Newman and Pusey, the other members of the early triumvirate. By tradition, and by descent, he was a connecting-link between the old, the half-forgotten, and the new, which to him was but the old revived. And thus he was in his own

personality an example of that continuity, the assertion of which was the mainspring of the Oxford Movement.

The distinguishing importance of his work, as compared with that of the other two, was that he alone could say, as old but unfamiliar truths were set before the world, "It seems exactly what my father always taught me."

Born at Fairford on April 25th—S. Mark's Day—1792, John Keble was descended through his father from a family originally of Suffolk, but since the sixteenth century established in Gloucestershire. Among his ancestors he might include Sir Henry Keble, Lord Mayor of London in the reign of Henry VIII, praised of the chroniclers for his pious generosity; and, coming down to later days, a Richard Keble, one of many who had held the invidious post of judge at the time of the Civil War, and had found it difficult to give satisfaction to either party. Through his mother, Sarah, daughter of the Rev. John Maule, of Ringwood, Hampshire, Keble claimed a Scottish connexion, which may have been in part responsible for the affection and reverence with which he always spoke of the displaced Stuart dynasty.

He was the second of a family of five: Elizabeth, the eldest, born a year before him, was a companion of his early reading and the associate of his later life. Thomas, his brother, and a year his junior, followed in his steps at

Corpus Christi, Oxford, as a Scholar, and, subsequently, as Fellow and Tutor ; finally retiring to a country living at Bisley, in his native county. Two other sisters—Sarah (1796–1814) and Mary Ann (1799–1826), his early confidante and friend—made the group complete.

The family would appear to have been one of those which had steadily and quietly maintained Catholic doctrine after the Revolution, and on this account has been supposed to be of Non-Juring descent. All that is definitely known is that John Keble sympathized with the Non-Jurors, and people, owing to the confusion between religion and politics, were often inclined to identify the ordinary High Anglican position with that of their Non-Juring brethren. Be this as it may, his father was a good scholar, a Tory in politics, and a theologian on the old paths, who devoted himself to the service of his cure of Coln S. Aldwyn's with regularity and care, maintained the rights due to his position as parish priest, and was likely to impress his sons with his own convictions.

John's early training was largely in the care of his two aunts—his father's sisters—to whose house in Fairford the boy would go in the morning for wholesome teaching ; and, though his later education was taken over by his father, who taught him, it is said, only when he wished to learn, family tradition still claims a portion of the credit for the maiden aunts.

After some years of this domestic teaching, Mr. Keble took his son to try his fortunes in the competitions for Scholarships at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, of which he himself had been a Fellow. The trial was a severe test for a boy of only just fourteen, and the field against him was a strong one. He was, however, successful, and entered the College in December, 1806.

Corpus was a very limited society, and Keble at once found himself one of a small number of students living on the most easy and pleasant terms among themselves, and with the Fellows and Tutors of the College.

The friends of this Oxford life were men of very varied stamp. There was, first, the Corpus group of friends : Coleridge, the nephew of the poet, and Keble's subsequent biographer, of whom, writing home a few years later, he says, "I love him more dearly every time I see him"; Dyson, to whose persuasion, it is said, the publication of *The Christian Year* was largely due; and Cornish, "pure-hearted as a child—affectionate"—about whose death in 1849 Keble thus opened his heart to Dyson: "One feels that this world can never be the same without him. . . . My dear Dyson, do ask for me that I may meet *him* again." Then Tucker, who found his call to work in India; and Ellison, afterwards Tutor at Balliol, genial of temper, and leaving the stamp of his originality on everything he handled. Another of a different

type was Arnold, the gulf between whose intellectual outlook and his own, Keble must have found it difficult to bridge, but who attracted him at once by the very fearlessness and honesty of his beliefs, and for whom he had such feelings of friendship as not even later disagreements could remove. In 1827, when Arnold stood for the Head-mastership of Rugby, Keble wrote a testimonial for him, and in 1840, when they had drifted far apart, he is very anxious to avoid the risk of hurting Arnold's feelings by the publication of his tract on "Mysticism," even suggesting that he should send it to Arnold for comment. In the spring of the same year he writes to Pusey : "I have had an Easter letter from Arnold, so kind and mitigated in tone that I cannot but be comforted by it. . . . I feel somehow that we are nearer to each other than we have been." Another, by whose friendship Keble set great store, was Miller, of Worcester. A few years older than Keble, he was also of a somewhat retiring disposition, but with just those qualities of simple, unassuming goodness that would naturally have brought the two together.

These were some of the friends whom Keble influenced, and whose influence he felt. In almost every case the intimacy of Corpus days remained unbroken. The later interchange of visits furnished welcome opportunities of passing once again through old familiar scenes and memories ; the more affectionately, now that

their paths no longer lay together. But these years did more than build up life-long friendship. In the free discussion and debate of friends, concerning itself with all the current topics and events, young Keble's mind must soon have learned to think and reason, and to make its own foundations sure. For they were days of much activity in the wider world—the great war with its underlying issues ; the stirring of the Romantic Movement, to the inner life of which Keble was introduced by Coleridge, himself so closely connected with it ; events in Ireland still fresh in the memory of every one—these and many other subjects formed material enough for mutual sharpening of wits and trial of the principles which had hitherto been accepted as unquestioned.

At that time too there was a College rule that Bachelor Scholars should reside, which had the stimulating effect of bringing the minds of the younger men into touch with the maturer judgment of their elders. In these surroundings Keble passed the four years of his life from fourteen to eighteen, when most boys would now be at school and looking forward to Oxford. At first his tutor was the Rev. W. N. Darnell, of whom his pupil had most grateful recollections. "Liking him as well as I do," he writes to his sister Elizabeth, "I never think I can take too much trouble for him," and to him Keble later dedicated some of his published sermons.

His home letters at this period give the picture of a youth of wide interests, attached to his home, and warmly interested in the welfare of a favourite horse or dog, affectionately respectful to his parents, brimming over with banter to the younger members of the family, of which the following advice to his brother is a sample : " If you think me more remiss than I ought to be in answering your letters, recollect that philosophers have something better to do than to write nonsense to children, especially such impertinent ones as you." (He was one year younger !) " I shall not be satisfied with your proceedings at my return unless I find you perfect master of all the English, Greek, Latin, Welsh, Chinese, Siberian, Botany Bay, Hottentot, and High Dutch Classics."

At Oxford he walks with his friends, and takes his part in the College and University life, reading the lessons in chapel, for which, as he confessed, he was late the first morning, through mistaking the Oriel bell for that of Corpus. He is asked to a wine-party " but, of course, declined," though later on he gave one of his own.

Meanwhile, he is reading the classics steadily and widely, partly for his tutor and partly for his own enjoyment. He finds the fifth book of Euclid " uncommonly tough," and compares notes with his sister Elizabeth, as he begins to read his Butler and Hooker, for both of whom he came to entertain a very warm admiration.

He tried on more than one occasion, but without success, for the University prizes, and eventually took his Degree at Easter, 1810, distinguishing himself by being placed in the First Class of both Schools, Classics and Mathematics—a feat previously performed by no one but Sir Robert Peel.

The next step in his University career was an Oriel Fellowship, to which he was elected the same day as Whately—afterwards Archbishop of Dublin. The reputation of the Oriel Common Room of that day stood high, and Keble straightway found himself a member of a society, which was the centre of the intellectual life of the University. But it is probable that Keble's natural shyness, which had given way before the intimacy of life at Corpus, prevented him from appreciating Oriel as much as might have been expected. He found it uncongenial: the attempt to treat all things as fit subjects for the exercise of intellect was opposed to his instinctive feeling. To the other Fellows, doubtless, he appeared reserved and uncommunicative.

During the next few years he had no regular tutorial work, and was consequently able to devote a good deal of time to private reading on sufficiently general lines: history, literature, theology, all claimed his attention. He learned Hebrew, and gave an indication of the way his mind was drifting by his interest in such names as Cranmer, Ridley, Andrewes, Jewell,

Latimer and Jeremy Taylor. Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying* seemed to him to provide a standard both for literary and moral effort. "I cannot tell you," he writes to a friend, "the delight it has given me. Spenser, I think, comes nearest his spirit in all respects. Milton is like him in richness and depth, but in morality seems to be as far below him as pride is below humility." For the latter, as might be presumed, he has scant affection, "but I must try to get rid of this dislike and lay his faults, if I can, upon times and circumstances, and not upon himself."

Such judgment may appear inadequate, but it sprang from feelings of which the application might indeed be modified by ripper thought and reading, but which in themselves were permanent.

In 1812 Keble achieved further Academical distinction by securing the prizes for both the English and the Latin Essay—the one on "Translation from dead languages," and the other on "A comparison of the qualities, as military historians, of Xenophon and Caesar."

His vacations were divided between his home, visits to his friends, and, sometimes, reading-parties. He was ready to assist his brother Tom in his College work, and in 1814, with many misgivings about his unfitness for the task, he became one of the Public Examiners. This office he discharged from

Michaelmas, 1814, to Easter, 1816, and again from Michaelmas, 1821, to Easter, 1823.

The six years from the time he came up to Corpus as a modest freshman, had now raised him to the very top of the ladder of University reputation. A Double First Class, a Fellow of Oriel, the winner of both Prize Essays, his reputation was such that Newman could describe him as "the first man in Oxford." The University, however, was not to be his final destiny, nor yet another field which perhaps may have attracted him. "Westminster Hall," he tells his family, after a sight-seeing trip to London in 1814, "is a place better calculated than any other I ever saw to fill a man with oratorical ambition." Some years later he visited the House of Commons with, on the whole, agreeable feelings of surprise. He found it "more gentlemanlike and less clever than I had expected. I felt as if I could have spoken quite as well myself as my Lord Palmerston."

But his life's journey lay along another road, for, in spite of great misgivings, his mind had been made up to give himself to the Church's ministry.

The recent death of his sister Sarah, in the summer of 1814—the first separation in the family—had made him think with added earnestness upon the mysterious workings of God's love to men, and, in the privileges and responsibilities of his approaching Ordination,

he recognized another signal instance of God's goodness. So he could write to Coleridge : "The salvation of one soul is worth more than the framing of the Magna Charta of a thousand worlds. . . . Can there be, even among the angels, a higher privilege that we can form any idea of, than the power of contributing to the everlasting happiness of our neighbour, to be especially delegated and assigned to us by Almighty God? I would that I were as free from worldly care and ambition as the thought of what I hope will be my high calling ought to make me."

As the time drew near he felt more and more keenly the sense of his unworthiness for that life on which he was to enter. "Pray earnestly, my dear, my best friend," he writes immediately before his Ordination, "that He will give me His grace that I may not be altogether unworthy of the sacred office on which I am rashly, I fear, even now entering, but that some souls hereafter may have cause to bless me. Pray that I may be saved from vanity, from envy, from discontent, from impure imaginations ; that I may not grow weary, nor wander in heart from God's service."

Years afterwards he wrote in the same strain to one just entering the Priesthood : "My dear —, take the word of one who knows, by sad experience, that there is no comfort for an ordained person but in really striving, night and day, to keep his Ordination vows,

and especially that one in which we bind ourselves to frame and fashion our living according to the doctrine of CHRIST—i.e. really and truly to lead holy lives—to please Him in thought, word, and deed.”¹

At the same time, the innate sense of humour was in no danger of being stifled. He tells his sister that he is to go before Levett of Christ Church, who was Examining Chaplain to the Bishop, while he himself was examining in the Schools. “If he plucks me, I have made a vow to pluck all his pupils for the next year.”

He was ordained Deacon at Trinity in 1815, and Priest exactly twelve months later by the Bishop of Oxford,² and immediately undertook the temporary charge of two small villages, East Leach and Burthorpe, close to Fairford. Here he worked till the beginning of 1818, maintaining his Oxford connexion for some time after his Ordination by being Examiner, but otherwise having his headquarters with his family at Fairford, and occupying himself with his parochial work.

From his Gloucestershire curacy he keeps up a regular correspondence with his brother Tom, now a Tutor at Corpus, telling him all the home gossip and news. “I am going to dine with the Lord of the Manor next Thursday, and am sadly afraid of the cold wind about the calves of my legs when I shall be

¹ *Spiritual Letters* cxiii.

² Edward Legge.

walking up the path with my silk stockings on." Another letter, as was often the case in his lighter vein, runs in easy verse :

"Sir, I'm a Gloucestershire Divine,
And this a letter small of mine,
Which, thus in guise of humble suitor,
Bowling, accosts a Reverend Tutor."

His absence from Oxford was not to be of long duration. At the end of 1817 he was called upon to fill the place of Davison, as one of the Tutors at Oriel, and, not without some hesitation, he accepted. He was reluctant to leave his curacy, but he might hope to work the two together, and he felt that it was something in the nature of a duty to obey the College call. So for the next five years he gave himself up to teaching undergraduates, regarding his work as a kind of pastoral cure, and endeavouring to exert a spiritual influence on those with whom he had to deal.

During this time he visited Yorkshire, and, among other sights, was greatly impressed by the magnificence of Wentworth. Fountains Abbey elicited the confession, "I have so much of the friar in me that I had rather see an old abbey church than almost anything besides"; while of Ripon he remarks that "Brown wigs are commoner here than I ever saw them anywhere else, and seem to be universally assumed by shopkeepers, etc., after a certain time of life as an ensign of dignity."

At Oriel his interest in his pupils was keen

and personal, leading him to begin reading with them at 6 a.m., though even so he longed for greater opportunities for private study. Many of them, as in the case of Sir William Heathcote, were afterwards among his warmest friends. To these years too at Oxford, he owed, through Coleridge, his acquaintance with Southey and with Heber, whom he met in 1820 at Commemoration.

Newman and Pusey were elected Fellows of the College in 1822 and 1823 respectively. Newman, although their friendship was of later growth, was struck by Keble's unassuming manner, and wrote to Mr. Bowden of his introduction to the College: "I could bear the congratulations of Copleston, but when Keble advanced to take my hand I quite shrank, and could have nearly shrunk into the floor, ashamed at so great an honour." Pusey's wish to stand for Oriel largely sprang from a desire to know Keble, who had examined him, *vivâ voce*, in the Schools. The fact that Keble was a Fellow added interest to Oriel in the eyes of those who came to visit it. Pupils and acquaintances alike were impressed with the strength of his personality and unaffected goodness, an impression not diminished by his natural lightheartedness.

Meanwhile, the parish work in Gloucestershire was shared between the two Keble brothers, each of them, as far as possible in term time, riding out from Oxford for alternate

Sundays, while their father undertook the work in the week. But John was not really satisfied with his Oriel position, and he longed sometimes to give himself more closely to what he gradually came to feel was his rightful business.

The death of his mother in May, 1823, supplied an additional reason for his return to the closer neighbourhood of his father. Her death suggested the idea which underlies the verses for the Annunciation in *The Christian Year*, though the form, in which they there appear, is somewhat different to the poem as originally composed. Some stanzas he regarded as too intimate for publication when that book came out, and substituted others in their place. One of those suppressed, and later published in the *Miscellaneous Poems*, reveals the feeling of self-reproach which his great bereavement caused :

“Alas, when those we love are gone,
Of all sad thoughts 'tis only one
Brings bitterness indeed :
The thought what poor, cold, heartless aid
We lent to cheer them while they stayed :
This makes the conscience bleed.”

Accordingly, in 1823, the Tutorship was given up ; its close was marked by a present of plate, the inscription on which told a tale of kindly feeling and grateful memory :

“JOHANNI KEBLE.

DISCIPULORUM ORIELENSIIUM PIETAS.

MDCCCXXIII.”

To the curacies of East Leach and Burthorpe he now added the adjoining one of Southrop, where he lived. Here, within easy reach of Fairford, once again he set himself to minister to the spiritual needs of his parishioners. The scanty population (which together did not exceed a thousand) allowed him to maintain his touch with younger friends by taking pupils. Among these were Isaac Williams, Hurrell Froude, and Robert Wilberforce, for whom it was a time which left a permanent impress on their future lives and characters. To Isaac Williams, wondering at that which brought so distinguished a son of Oxford thus to leave her for an unremunerative country curacy, Keble's invitation to be of the party seemed in after days the turning-point of life. In the case of Hurrell Froude, affectionate and keen of wit, the influence was mutual. The quick, impulsive temper of the younger man learned much from contact with the moderation and restraint of Keble. To his love of intellectual disputations and of startling paradox Froude came to join the deeper principles and motives of his tutor. Isaac Williams, in his record of the impressions of this time, tells the oft-repeated anecdote of Keble shyly saying—"Froude, you thought *Law's Serious Call* was a clever book; it seemed to me as if you had said the Day of Judgment will be a pretty sight." And in return, Froude's natural restlessness, his right-

eous fury, as he came to realize the persecutions and the dangers which beset the Church, were not without effect upon the mind from which his own convictions had been partly drawn.

A few years later, when they were fighting side by side, Froude said that Keble was his fire, but he was Keble's poker.

By the same hand it was that Robert Isaac Wilberforce, another of the pupils, bred in Evangelical traditions, was brought to range himself on the same side in the struggle that was imminent; and afterwards, when doubts had ripened into action, and he had joined the Roman Church, he said that it was only Keble's influence that had kept him in the English Church so long.

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the place the Southrop intimacies held as a preparation for the struggle in which all the friends were soon to be involved. For the present, the reading and the arguments, springing no doubt with greatest frequency from the bold originality of Froude, were interspersed with games, in which the tutor joined as heartily as any of his pupils; indeed the composite retainer, who discharged the triple function of gardener, groom, and clerk, considered that "Master is the greatest boy of the lot."

Withal, it was a time for clearing issues, and for teaching loyalty to principles that had not long to wait for application.

His life among his pupils was, however, interrupted by the offer of the curacy of Hursley from Archdeacon Heathcote, uncle to Sir William Heathcote, Keble's Oriel pupil. He, in the previous year, had been offered, and had declined, the Archdeaconry of Barbadoes, because he did not think it right to leave his father—an objection not involved in the acceptance of the humbler offer. In October, therefore, he moved to Hursley, where he spent the time that his biographer and friend adjudged to be “the brightest and most sunshiny of his life.” But, within a year, he was again recalled to Fairford by the death of his youngest sister, Mary Anne. His letters show how bitterly he felt the loss of her whom he had playfully termed “his sweetheart.” “Somehow or other I have for years been accustomed to talk to her far more freely than to anybody else in the world,” and, for her sake, who “always wanted everybody to live in sunshine, I must be ashamed and afraid to feel desolate.” And so he went forward, occupying himself with acting as curate to his father at Coln S. Aldwyn's, with study, and with writing, in spare moments, the poems that in 1827 he published in *The Christian Year*.

It was not long before there was an attempt to get him back to Oxford. On Copleston's appointment to the Bishopric of Llandaff, in 1828, Keble was pressed by his friends, among

whom were Froude and Dyson, to stand for the Provostship of Oriel, thus rendered vacant. The other candidate was Hawkins, and it looked at first as if there was to be a contest. Keble, while fully recognizing the claims of Hawkins, was not averse from the idea, but, rather than be the cause of College strife, was inclined only to respond to a unanimous invitation. Throughout the period, during which the negotiations were in progress, the mutual relations of the two specially concerned were examples of unselfishness and moderation. "My very kind love to old Hawkins," writes Keble, "and tell him I think we had better put the Provostship in commission: Tyler take the red gown, Hawkins the work, and I the play." As things turned out, the friends of Keble found themselves in a minority, and he accordingly withdrew his name in order to allow unanimous election. In the light of later history it is curious to note that Pusey and Newman used their interest for Hawkins. To them Keble was comparatively little known, and they would seem to have had their doubts about his business qualities and his power of managing the undergraduates. Newman said that "If an angel's place was vacant, we should look towards Keble, but we were only electing a Provost." Keble did not regard himself as particularly unfitted for the place: in many ways the work appealed to him, but, once the matter was decided, he dismissed it from his

mind, and cheerfully continued to assist his father in the quiet round of life at Fairford.

This decision led to his refusal of the offer of the Vicarage of Hursley, in 1829, and that of Paignton in Devonshire, which the Bishop of Exeter, considering him "the most eminently good man in the Church," two years later invited him to take. In his leisure time he occupied himself with thinking of the social questions, which were gradually being forced on men's attention; but his first active intervention in political affairs was connected with the struggle for emancipation of the Roman Catholics. After the passing of the Act, Sir Robert Peel submitted himself to the University for re-election. Keble opposed him warmly, and issued a set of questions to the electors urging them to vote against him. This line, in which he was opposed to Pusey, was one dictated by the general notion of the Christian Church within the Christian State—the inconsistency of which, in the face of then existing circumstances, was not yet fully realized—and also by his strong anxiety that "the University should be careful to do nothing to encourage the dangerous laxity of modern politics."

In 1830-1 he held the post of one of the Examiners to the India House, and in the latter year he began to work at his edition of Hooker, published five years later. In the winter he was elected to the Professorship of

Poetry at Oxford. He had previously declined to stand in opposition to Milman, but now that the field was open he was glad to accept the post. The subject was congenial, and the Professorship gave him at once a recognized place in Oxford life.

In this capacity it fell to Keble to write the Ode for the Installation of the Duke of Wellington as Chancellor of the University in 1834. Curiously enough, there had been an attempt to induce Sir Robert Peel to allow himself to be put in nomination for this office in opposition to the Duke, but he declined. The matter must have, apparently, caused no little stir in academic circles, for Keble writes to Rose (January 18, 1834): "They are in hot water at Oxford about the Chancellorship; I hope to be able to keep out of it, but the Radicals there tempt one strongly to be active by their ungenerous conduct in putting up the man they most hate against the man they most fear." The Poetry Professorship, moreover, by bringing him up from time to time to Oxford for his statutory lectures, afforded opportunities of meeting and of keeping touch with friends. It was only by degrees, and through the influence of Froude, that Newman was included in this number. Keble had been suspicious of his Liberal and Evangelical tendencies, and Newman too had been much influenced by Whately. But as time went on they drew together. In August, 1831, Keble

writes to him : "I want some of your criticism, for somehow I cannot get it out of my head that you are a real honest man." This change was largely due to Froude, who said, "If I were asked what good deed I had ever done, I should say that I had brought Keble and Newman to understand each other." The value of Froude's good deed the future was to show.

CHAPTER II

THE MOVEMENT

RELIGIOUS movements rarely spring from single causes. As men are of different moulds, they sometimes reach a common goal by different ways. Frequently they are found working side by side in ignorance of each other's presence, until some chance event reveals a link that holds them all together. Then, as travellers do when meeting on untrodden soil, they compare experiences, and are surprised to learn that they have all the time been moving in the same direction.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was, no doubt, chiefly a religious movement; but its history would be only partly told without some account being taken of the other causes which assisted its development. The same is true of the reaction of the early nineteenth century, which takes its name from Oxford.

From very many points of view the order of the day was change. The effect of Continental theories and doings had not been wasted upon England; reform might take the place of

revolution, but, with the confidence of youth, reform was comprehensive in its ambition, and sanguine of success. Among the many objects of attack, the Church could hardly be passed over. For the Church, by a pardonable confusion of ideas, was supposed, in England as in France, to represent the embodiment of opposition to reform; and earned accordingly the indignation of reformers.

From another quarter too it was feeling from abroad the effects of Liberalism in thought. Old axioms touching its existence, its beliefs, which had been universally accepted while in practice they had very largely been ignored, could no longer be regarded as outside the sphere of controversy.

For many of its friends, who were uneasy at the recent inroads on the sacred precincts of Establishment by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and by the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, there seemed at first no other ground on which to take their stand; but the temper of the Government, under the influence of the newly-passed Reform Bill, called imperatively for action. The Bishops, insulted in the street by the mob, received a peremptory summons from high quarters to "set their house in order." The air was full of rumours of impending measures for the alteration of the liturgy and the adaptation of its ritual, "to meet the spirit of the age." "The Church as it now stands," Arnold wrote in June, 1832,

"no human power can save." To Hugh James Rose, "Christian Advocate" at Cambridge, and editor of the *British Magazine*, it seemed that "whatever is done ought to be *quickly* done, for the danger is immediate, and I should have little fear if I thought that we could stand for ten or fifteen years as we are." The pressing need, amid the general shifting of the old foundations, was to find a point on which to rally.

The remedies suggested were the measure of each man's conception of the Church. Arnold, his mind full of his own far-reaching schemes of reform, advocated the opening of the Church's doors to the Dissenters, excluding only Unitarians. Some, apathetic and indifferent, were prepared to acquiesce, and make the best of that which could no longer be avoided in the rush of new ideas. When every one was looking forward, those who were to lead the Oxford Movement determined to look back. They saw in the present troubles the result of failure to assert the principles, that were the true foundation of the Church's liberty, and held the sovereign antidote for present anxieties to be the vindication of forgotten rights. In this resolve they found an ally in the spirit influencing English literature through the writings of Sir Walter Scott, who was teaching his countrymen to look with greater reverence on the past. On the same side, although unconsciously, was

thrown the weight of *The Christian Year* itself. Dr. Lloyd also, some time before, as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, had given lectures on the English Prayer Book, showing to what extent it was taken and adapted from older Liturgies. This study received a further impetus from the Rev. W. Palmer, of Worcester, who, in 1832, published his *Origines Liturgicae*, dealing with the same subject. "Mr. Palmer's book," writes Keble, "is first-rate, and when you meet him he is the most modest and unpretending of men—just the man to write on the Prayer Book." The effect of both was to recall attention to the history and character of the system which was now upon its trial.

To the threats of an Erastian Parliament, to the apathy or doubts of friends, the champions of the Church returned one answer. Founded by, and resting on, Divine commission, with its proper officers, laws, and customs, it was a spiritual society, and, if joined at present with the State for mutual advantage, was in essence wholly independent of it.

There were also many living with whom the principles appealed to were familiar: such were Joshua Watson, Mr. Sikes of Guilsborough, and, as has been said, Keble himself.

The prophecy of Mr. Sikes in 1833, immediately before the Movement started, will bear repeating. He was disturbed at the universal suppression of the great truth of the

Holy Catholic Church. "Whereas," he wrote, "the other articles of the Creed seem now to have thrown it into the shade, it will seem, when it is brought forward, to swallow up the rest . . . and woe betide those, whoever they are, who shall in the course of Providence have to bring it forward. . . . They will be endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted ; there will be one great outcry of Popery from one end of the country to the other."

Enough has been said to show the relative position of the parties. During 1832 the storm was gathering, and in 1833 it burst. The cause was the Bill for the suppression of the Irish Bishoprics. The forcible extinction of ten sees, coupled with the arbitrary rearrangement of their revenues, seemed, to those who had been thinking of these things, an outrage.

At this moment Keble had his chance of speaking and of being heard, by being nominated to preach the Assize Sermon at Oxford on July 14, 1833. A contemporary observer, J. B. Mozley, gives an indication of what his friends expected of him. "Keble comes up to-morrow to preach the Assize Sermon. The Assize Sermon is essentially a Conservative one, so I do not know how he will manage."

For, as far as his early Conservatism might have disinclined him to expect, still less to wish for, any change in the relations of Church and State, his opinion had been seriously modified

by recent applications of the theory on which that union rested. "Things go on at such a rate," he writes, "that one is quite giddy . . . anything, humanly speaking, will be better than for the Church to go on in union with such a State"; and again, a few months later, in February, 1833, "I suppose that there can be no doubt that the die of separation is now cast." Newman at Rome in March, on his way back from his journey abroad with Froude, was in good heart about the prospects of the struggle. "We find Keble is at length roused, and (if once up) he will prove a second S. Ambrose."

The sermon itself was preached on 1 Samuel xii. 23 : "As for me, God forbid that I should sin against the law in ceasing to pray for you ; but I will teach you the good and the right way."

Drawing his warning from the punishment which fell upon the action of the Jews in asking Samuel for a king, Keble prophesied the fate of other nations which should follow the same path. The symptoms of the wrong decision might be different, as would be the reasons and excuses for it. The punishment might be deferred, but it would surely come on all who wilfully reject God's law. It might be that the "Apostolic Church should be forsaken, degraded, nay, trampled on and despoiled by the State and people of England." What, then, should be its course? Guided by

Samuel's example, humble intercession, and earnest remonstrance. Above all, let the individual members of the Church look to it that by the deepening of their own devotion, and by the steadfast performance of ordinary duties, they might not be unworthy of serving in so holy a cause. To those who thus approached their task, victory, "complete, universal, eternal" was assured.

The title, "National Apostasy," under which the sermon was published a fortnight later, after the passing of the Bill, expressed his sentiments in face of what, to him, was a distinct repudiation by the State of Christian principles. In the preface he alluded to the need for action, or, at all events, for protest. It was the reiteration of the advice that he had given twelve months earlier in a letter on the proper line of conduct for the clergy, "with a view to the possible proceedings of the first Revolutionary Parliament." The loyalty that the State might claim from them as citizens should urge them to be passive so long as conscience would allow, but it behoved Churchmen to consider "how they might continue their communion with the Church Established, . . . without any taint of those Erastian principles on which she is now avowedly to be governed."

Such conclusions can only have been reached reluctantly. The very title of his sermon would be evidence that he condemned the

action of the State, because it was a falling short of that which he regarded as its rightful mission. The accepted union of the Church and State involved an understanding, of which the recent action of the Government was the violation. By this hypothesis, which was then a part of the accepted faith of the majority of Churchmen, the State was still a creature with a definite religious conscience, and with responsibility for the maintenance of that truth, of which it was the temporal guardian. They forgot that, when the individuals that compose the State are not agreed upon such matters, these counsels of perfection can no longer be attained. But, however warmly Keble, along with others of his day, may have regretted the departure of the old arrangement, he never doubted as to where to lay the blame. Where Arnold gave it to the Church, Keble, with unfaltering voice, condemned the State.

The Assize Sermon gave the signal for concerted action. Newman always said that he considered and kept the day as the starting-point of the Oxford Movement. Acting on Rose's earlier invitation, Palmer, Percival, and Froude came to Hadleigh on July 25th, as one of them expressed it, "to do what they might towards the defence of the Church." Newman and Keble were invited, but were unable to be present. The conference lasted for four days, and showed the differences of opinion as to policy, which were certain to emerge as soon

as any definite scheme was formulated. The difficulties, that had been found at Hadleigh, re-appeared at Oxford, where Palmer and Froude, on their return, at once began to undertake the task of laying down a policy of action in order to meet the most immediate dangers. It was at first proposed to have some declaration of agreement, which would include a protest against any efforts to interfere with the Establishment. This, owing to Keble's opinion that "the union of Church and State as it is now understood is actually sinful," was abandoned, and it was decided to emphasize the two main points of the Apostolical Succession and the defence of the Prayer Book. There was also disagreement, partly due to temperament, as to the means most suitable for furthering these objects. Keble was for a formula: "We pledge ourselves to one another in our respective stations, reserving our canonical obedience," and on this line drew up two forms of proposed association. Newman approved of this, but he and Froude were together in their opposition to Palmer's scheme for an association, to be organized throughout the country. They thought that the case was one for individual utterances, incisive and spontaneous, based on personal conviction, rather than for ponderous and formal statements by a larger body, which seemed to them likely to be slow-moving and unwieldy. Eventually the idea of an association was abandoned, to be replaced by a clerical

address to the Archbishop, assuring him of the signatories' sympathy, and of their adherence to "the Apostolic doctrine and polity of the Church," and of their attachment to the Liturgy. This address, which, it was hoped, would have the effect of rousing the clergy, was presented in February, 1834, by a deputation, of whom Keble was one; and was followed three months later by the lay address, signed by 230,000 heads of families, and couched in much the same terms, with the addition of more distinct expressions in favour of the Establishment.

Meanwhile, the Tracts were being produced and circulated in the shape which had been advocated by Newman and Froude. The text that was prefixed to the first five volumes, in which they were afterwards collected, shows the spirit of their composition: "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?" The greater part at first was Newman's, but many others helped. Keble wrote several of the Tracts, and would probably have written more, if he had not been already fully occupied in the preparation of his edition of Hooker. Leaving on one side his treatise on "The Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church," published in 1841 as No. 89, his earlier Tracts were in the nature of short, straightforward, clearly-written pamphlets. In one he shows the principle that underlies the selection of the Sunday lessons, enlarging on his favourite thought of the

analogy between God's dealings with the Jewish nation and with individual Christians. In another he enters his protest against latitudinarianism and liberalism in theology, pointing out the danger of relying on feelings and emotions of love for CHRIST, unless they rest upon the foundations of true doctrine : "CHRIST is to be loved and served, not such as men choose to imagine Him, but such as He really and truly is."

But the general aim of his early contributions to the Tracts was the teaching of the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, and a common argument runs through them all. The first Tract that he wrote (*Rudis indigestaque moles* he called it, when he sent it to Newman in September, 1833) was on "Adherence to Apostolical Succession the safest course" : and in method it perhaps may serve as an example of the influence of Butler's thought upon his mind. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the doctrine is historically doubtful, it can still be shown to be the safest course ; safest for prudent Christians, who would hesitate to think lightly of an institution possibly Divine, and safest in view of the practical results of the apparent connexion between Apostolical Succession and the maintenance of the Faith, in that "the Apostolical Succession is the main outwork of Apostolical doctrine." The countries which have sacrificed the one have been unable to retain the other unimpaired.

In 1834, the Oxford world was in a turmoil over the question of the relaxation of subscription to the Articles, then required upon Matriculation. A Bill had been introduced into Parliament to sanction it, and a bare majority of the Heads of Houses had approved the principle.

So generally accepted to-day is the conception of the older Universities, as of institutions recognizing to a very great degree the claims of State control, that it is sometimes difficult to realize how the first mention of such a conception must have struck the imagination of an earlier day, accustomed to regard them, and especially Oxford, as the daughters of the Church. It may be that in 1834, as later, the upholders of the existing order failed to discriminate between the University and the Colleges. What was clearly forbidden by the religious nature of the foundations in the different Colleges, might possibly have been admitted for the University; but, from the controversy that arose, more serious issues gradually emerged. Among the many pamphlets which the strife evoked, was one by Dr. Hampden, consisting of *Observations on Religious Dissent*, with special reference to the proposed modification of the Statutes. He had given his course of Bampton Lectures two years earlier, composed, it was said, with the help, certainly under the influence, of Blanco White. They excited little notice

at the time ; they were somewhat involved, and the public nerves were not then so highly strung. His "Observations" travelled somewhat beyond the single point of whether or not undergraduates should be required to sign the Articles ; and, without fully realizing the import of his own statements, he certainly said much that was depreciatory of the general claims of definite belief. On both these grounds Keble and his friends opposed the alteration. That they were supported in their opinion by the overwhelming sense of the University was clearly demonstrated by the vote in Convocation of May 19, 1835, which, by a majority of eight to one, declared against the proposals of the Heads. So, for the present, Oxford was unchanged, and the relations of the University to the traditional teaching of the Church maintained.

For the first two years of the Movement Keble had been living on at Fairford, with occasional visits to Oxford for his Poetry Lectures, or, as he found occasion, for his work on Hooker.

After his father's death in January, 1835, the Fairford home was broken up, and later in the year Keble was free to accept the Vicarage of Hursley, vacant unexpectedly, and once more offered by Sir William Heathcote. In October, 1835, also, though he had fallen from his horse and broken his collarbone the day before, he married Miss Charlotte Clarke,

sister to Mrs. Thomas Keble, and soon settled into what was henceforward to become his home.

In the beginning of 1836, by the death of Dr. Burton, a vacancy occurred in the post of Regius Professor of Divinity, and all the three friends—Pusey, Newman, and Keble—were mentioned to Lord Melbourne as suitable successors. Newman wrote to Keble to urge him to accept, should the offer be made, even though his inclinations might lead him to reject any advancement coming from a Whig Government; and, writing on the possibility to Froude, he says, "I am more useful as I am, but Keble is a light too spiritual and subtle to be seen unless put upon a candlestick." In the event, as might have been anticipated, no one of the three was appointed, but, to the general astonishment, the Prime Minister's choice—due, it is supposed, to Whately's influence—fell on Dr. Hampden. In view of what had passed, and still more of what was likely to occur, the selection can hardly be considered to have been judicious. The unanimity, with which in 1834 opinions connected with his name had been condemned by Convocation, gave it the appearance of an open slight to the feelings of the University. Newman, however, thought, as he wrote to Pusey, that the appointment might clear the air: "Poor Keble's spirit was vexed for years, while he felt the evil but could not

grasp it. He seemed visionary and eccentric, while he was eating his heart out unsuccessfully attempting to analyse his own presagings, and to express disapprobation he could not help feeling. Are we not better off?" There was certainly no mistaking the support intended to be given to the liberal conception of theology such as Hampden's early pamphlet had expressed.

In Oxford the appointment became at once the main topic of conversation. Petitions, addresses, pamphlets, deplored and condemned it. In the general struggle Pusey and Newman played a considerable part, and Dr. Hampden's friends freely blamed them for what they thought his persecution. Arnold especially, writing an article published in the *Edinburgh* of April, with the title of "The Oxford Malignants," stigmatized the attack on Dr. Hampden as "bearing upon it the character not of error but of *moral wickedness*, and that of a small Oxford clique."

But in truth the hostility to the Government selection was by no means so confined. A petition circulated in the Oxford common rooms received the signatures of half the resident Masters, and the feeling led to the proposal of a Statute in Convocation, to disqualify the new Regius Professor from holding office on the board for nomination of select preachers, or from being consulted when a sermon might be called in question by the

Vice-Chancellor. The proposal was vetoed by the Proctors in March, 1836, upon which Keble, with prophetic foresight, said, "Others too may play at that game." It was proposed again, and passed in the ensuing term, under fresh Proctors, who received addresses of gratitude for their action from all over England. Keble thoroughly approved of these proceedings, though his work on Hooker again prevented him from being as active as his friends.

His five years' labour on Hooker, in which he had been much assisted by his brother, was just completed, and this year saw the light. For his purpose he had been obliged to study a good deal of contemporary literature, which he did not always find entirely to his liking, and on some of which he passes rather caustic comment to his sister. "To-day," he complains on one occasion, "I have been nearly choked with the bad jokes and insolence of Master Martin Marprelate, whose popularity, however, brings with it the consolation that the Queen's subjects then were as vulgar as the King's are now." The work consists of a textual collation of the several manuscripts, with a critical enquiry into the authenticity of the Sixth Book. It included also—which for general readers is perhaps the more interesting—a careful preface dealing with the circumstances of the time of Hooker, and an appreciation of the place he ought to hold in English Church history. Newman, when it was submitted to him in

proof, thought very highly of the preface, so highly, in fact, that Keble wrote to him: "You a little alarm me, as if I were breaking up such very new ground by it." In it he traces the various influences which bore upon the Church throughout the middle and the close of the sixteenth century. "The nucleus of the whole trouble was undoubtedly the question of Church authority"; and the current conceptions of Church government he classifies somewhat arbitrarily under the three heads of Papal, Erastian, and Presbyterian. After the Papal theory was at an end, Geneva was the chief opponent of Erastianism. The latter "would entirely deny the principle on which the Genevan innovation proceeded: whereas the High Churchmen (as they were called) of a later age would grant the principle but deny the application." The argument of Hooker on the relationship between Church and State rested on their supposed identity; which was, and is, the only ground on which the perfect theory can be maintained. But on this discussion Keble does not enter, beyond the general caution, "It were beyond the scope to enquire whether it has not terminated in rendering the Church throughout Protestant Europe too much a slave of the civil power."

In the troubled times, in which he found himself, Hooker seemed to Keble a protector of the Church, specially raised up by Providence. He furnished for Laud a connecting-link with

earlier days, as Laud and those who followed him did for Keble himself. By his historical position, by his vindication of Episcopacy against prevailing tendencies, and by his assertion of the Sacramental principle, Hooker drew at once the attention and affection of his editor.

In September Keble had the opportunity of speaking on another, but a kindred, subject. Chosen to preach the Visitation Sermon in Winchester Cathedral, he took for his subject "Primitive Tradition recognized in Holy Scripture." It was an hour and a half long, and he described himself to Newman as having "thundered it out more emphatically almost than ever I did anything in my life." The argument of the sermon, and of the added postscript, is designed to controvert the attitude of those who hold that, whatever may have been the value of Tradition in the Church's early days, while the Canon of the New Testament was incomplete, its place has now been taken by the written Scriptures. The two, he argued, are rather complementary than antagonistic to each other. For the arrangement of the Creeds, and for the right interpretation of the Scriptures, which in their turn correct it, recourse must be had to the verdict of Tradition. Again, to ascertain the Church's mind upon her discipline, her rites, the precise meaning of her formularies, it is necessary to consult the tradition, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Indeed, Scripture and Tradition are so close to

one another that he compares them to "two streams flowing down from the mountain of GOD, whose waters presently became blended, and it were but a vain and unpractical enquiry . . . how much of the healing draught came from one source and the other." At all times mutually essential to the guarding of the Faith, a proper adherence to Tradition was the most reliable defence at once against the spirit of irreverence, and against existing tendencies, as instanced by the recent appointment to the Regius Professorship at Oxford. The right of such appeal to the authority of the Undivided Church was to the end a fundamental article of Keble's creed, held with all the more devotion as the need grew more insistent.

Such thoroughness in dealing with the question of Tradition was another instance of the feeling, which had induced a change in the outward appearance of the Tracts themselves, and which found expression in the advertisement of the third collected volume, dated All Saints' Day, 1836. The early Tracts "were written as a man might give notice of a fire or inundation, to startle all who heard him, with only so much of doctrine or argument as might be necessary to account for their publication." The writers felt that, after men's attention had been once attracted, it was necessary and only right to amplify the earlier and cruder statements. Pusey was to a great extent responsible for this departure. Although at first he

hesitated to identify himself too closely, he had by this time definitely thrown in his lot with the party of the Tracts, and his accession gave them at once the benefit of his great learning and a University position. His study of the writings of the Fathers had convinced him that much of the existing opposition to Church doctrine sprang from their neglect, and might be modified by fuller knowledge. With the object of supplying this, and also of producing something which might counteract the influence of Hampden, Pusey conceived, in 1836, the notion of the "Library of the Fathers," which should bring translations of their writings within easy reach of students. For the editorship he enlisted the assistance of Newman and Keble—Keble asking that the dedication to the Archbishop might be limited to "respect for his high spiritual office; the rather that I think a time is coming when it will be impossible personally to compliment Bishops with a good conscience; and it is questionable whether our doing so at best is not a sort of impertinence."

Keble's direct contribution was *S. Irenaeus*, posthumously published; but a good share of the editorial work passed through his hands, and furnished him with constant occupation. He was now also engaged upon a metrical version of the Psalms, which he published in 1839, in the hope of providing a substitute for the loose, unsatisfactory versions of the Psalter then in use. The construction of the Psalms

made it difficult to translate them faithfully without being stilted, and this fidelity certainly interfered with even what chance of practical usefulness the version might have had. The Bishops of Winchester and Oxford declined to license it for general use in their dioceses, as had been hoped, although the latter agreed to accept the dedication. Keble was scarcely disappointed. In his author's preface he confessed that "the work was undertaken in the first instance with a serious apprehension, which has since grown into a full conviction, that the thing attempted is, strictly speaking, impossible."

Another occupation, which seemed to him a debt of friendship, was absorbing much of his time. Froude, whose health had for some time been an object of anxiety to those around him, died in February, 1836. He had been compelled to spend several winters in the warmer climate of Barbadoes, and though often able only to give counsel from a distance, he was always kept informed of what was going on. The sense of loss that followed on his death was more than merely personal. The work which they had done together had only deepened the impressions of the early days at Southrop. Warm in his affections, single of purpose, loyal to principles and ideals, with a singular perception of the humour that the world contains, original, in spite of the fact that "his highest ambition was to be a humdrum," Froude came to hold a place in Keble's

heart that no one else perhaps could ever fill. "Sometimes," he writes to Moberly in 1853, "I am in the humour to cry out, 'Oh, for one hour of Hurrell Froude to tell us something for our good.'"

Newman, who had been entrusted with the privilege of looking through Froude's papers, invited Keble to assist him. They thought it was a fitting tribute to his memory to make them better known. They looked with confidence to the admiration and enthusiasm that would follow on a frank revealing of his inner life. From "the picture of a mind" which they themselves had scarcely realized, the world might judge, and give its verdict on, the work to which that life had been devoted.

The papers were accordingly published,—under the title of *Remains of R. H. Froude*—two volumes in 1838, and, in spite of the feeling which they excited, two more the year following. Keble contributed the preface to the first two volumes, jointly with Newman, and was almost entirely responsible for that of the others. He pointed out in what respects wider experience and thought had justified what seemed in Froude like over-hasty statement. He vindicated Froude's appeal from the "Reformers" to "Catholic Antiquity"; for the loyalty of English Churchmen is to the Church Catholic, and they are not therefore under any obligation to accept what individuals may have said or done in opposition to it. As

far as their achievements might be able to stand this test, the Church of England might gratefully accept them. Whatever may have been the intention of the Reformers—and from their expressed opinions it was scarcely possible to rate their theological attainments very high—they had been providentially restrained from doing anything which would prevent the Church of England from holding firmly to Catholic faith and practice.

Writing to his sister-in-law, in November, 1838, Keble expressed his opinion very freely : “As to the Reformers,” he says, “I certainly do think that as a set they belonged to the same class with the Puritans and Radicals, and I have very little doubt that if we had lived in those times neither my father, nor you, nor Prevost, nor Harrison, would have had anything to do with them. And I think we shall never be able to make our ground good against either Romanists or Puritans till we have separated ourselves and our Liturgy from them.” There was here no attempt on Keble’s part to dissociate himself from Froude, and the uncompromising preface shared in the reception that attended the *Remains* themselves. Except from some few like Ward and Manning, who were much impressed, they drew a general chorus of condemnation. And, although the charge of indiscretion is not infrequently preferred against a clearness of conviction not shared by the

opponents, it can hardly be denied that Froude's language was in many instances calculated to arouse hostility.

For individual judgments are necessarily largely influenced by the atmosphere in which they are formed, and it was impossible for friends of Froude, so intimate as they were, to place themselves in the position of the outside public, now, for the first time, introduced to the outspoken criticisms of what were to many articles of faith. His friends could qualify them by their knowledge of the personality that they had loved; the general public had to judge by what it read.

The suspicions thus aroused produced, in 1838, a counter-move in Oxford against the party of the Movement, of which the true designs had been, as it was thought, avowed. The proposed appeal for the public commemoration of the names of the Reformers inevitably bore the character of an attempt to force the hand of those who shared the sentiments of the *Remains*. Refusal to subscribe would seem to brand them as disloyal: subscription, in the way in which it was proposed, would at once imply much more than either Newman, Pusey, or Keble were prepared to say. They could not help regarding it, as Pusey wrote to the Bishop of Oxford, as intended "to set the Reformers against the Fathers and to set up certain views which some people identify with the Reformers against those of

the ancient Church." Newman was quite clear that he could not join in it. Pusey had hoped to get it altered into such a form that they could conscientiously support it ; but his efforts failed. Keble "was not at all prepared to express a public dissent from Froude in his opinion of the Reformers as a party," and in the end they all declined.

Roughly coincident, in point of time, with these events, had been two minor incidents affecting Newman personally, and, through him, the Movement of which, against his will, he had become the leader. One was the Bishop of Oxford's Charge, in August, 1838, kindly meant but somewhat vaguely worded, which was to Newman so much like a general censure on the Tracts that he offered to suppress them. Keble alone, through deference to Episcopal authority, concurred with him in this, provided that the ground for the cessation was avowed to be indiscretion, and not doctrinal error.

The other was the fact of the suspicion engendered in the minds of Thomas Keble and his immediate following, by the sanction that Newman gave to the project for the translation of the Breviary. Keble again stood by with his encouragement ; but it was one of the straws which showed the way the tide was flowing.

In many ways these episodes may be said to mark a turning-point in the fortunes of the Movement. They sowed the seeds of

misconception, which, as always, either had to gather strength or die. It is doubtful how far this could have been avoided ; but the discussion is of academic interest only, and it is of little profit to apportion blame. The times were scarcely favourable to calm enquiry into motives. After the events of 1838 and 1839, when sides had been taken, it was impossible for matters, or for men, to stand exactly where they had been before. In point of fact the change was of a deeper character than any misconception, fertile as it was, could have created.

CHAPTER III

DIVERGENCE. 1839-1845

THE principles on which the encroachments of the State had been resisted, opened the door to another question, always present, but now forced into greater prominence by the natural sequence of events. The very measure of success, which had attended on the earlier efforts of the Movement, only served to throw the new problem into clearer view, as the obstacles that had obscured it were removed.

Although at first the pressure had been greatest in another quarter of the field, the necessity of dealing with the Roman Question had soon been felt. "The controversy with the Romanists," wrote Newman in January, 1836, "has overtaken us like a summer's cloud." Indeed, the general ignorance upon the subject had been one reason for continuing the Tracts in 1835, when it had been proposed that they should cease; and throughout the following year Newman was writing upon it in *The British Magazine*, under the title of "Home thoughts abroad."

A priori, it was certain that the Movement must involve the further task. The answer, which its leaders had returned to dangers menacing the Church, had been an appeal to the conception of the Church as a living body. To the majority of people such a presentment of the Church's character was new, and those who brought it forward, filled much the same position in the eyes of their contemporaries as the Non-jurors a century before. The attitude of Roman Catholics on the one hand, or of orthodox supporters of the Establishment on the other, was intelligible ; but for those who were English Churchmen, and who yet viewed the union of the Church and State as neither essential to the Church's being, nor indeed as an inseparable accompaniment of it, there was no accepted classification. They built, however, upon the foundations of Catholicity and Antiquity, and based on them the Church's claim to recognition of the truth of her Divine mission.

Made at first absolutely, such statements had to be substantiated. The claim put forward for the Church in England made it essential for the sake of her own members, as well as those of the Roman Communion, that her position should be defined. In the case of very many the controversy, by which this claim had always been accompanied, was an untrodden field. They had little knowledge, when it came to argument, of the respective

merits of the case, or of the wider issues which it would reveal. From this it followed that there were those who, coming fresh to the discussion, failed at times to hold the balance true. Nor was this all: judgments are but seldom formed by reason only; association, temperament—all that forms a mental atmosphere—will play its part, by lending a strength and depth to principles that are traditional, which the same principles when newly acquired will lack. Something of this it was that led Newman and Keble, starting from common ground, to arrive at different goals. The premises might be, and were, identical; but conclusions differed.

While Keble had inherited the principles on which he rested his defence of the Church, Newman, like very many others, had acquired them. This fact, assisted by his intellectual bent for logic, inclined the latter, and those who were in a similar position, to expect a theory more thorough in its working than the facts permitted. During the period that he was finding his religious principles, the Roman Question was not so pressing as it soon became, and, consequently, in his vision the English Church would appear more perfect and complete than was really the case. Before he had sufficient time to adjust the theory to the actual facts before him, disappointments, incidental to the expectations which he had formed, were already shaking its foundations.

Keble, on the other hand, was possessed of greater patience, and by tradition his outlook was more comprehensive.¹ From the first he had been trained to hold the root-conception of the essential unity of the Catholic Church, even though, as in the case of the great schism, the external expression of that unity might seem for the moment to be interrupted. Such a conception, though it might appear to lack the simplicity and the logical completeness of other views, had the merit of recognizing the facts of history, and avoided the necessity of straining them so as to make them fit in with any *a priori* theory. He was thus enabled to estimate at their true value the difficulties which, when presented to the other, seemed insuperable. The foundation of his hopes went deeper than the test of success and the degree of recognition accorded to the principles at stake. He felt as keenly as did Newman about Tract 90, or as Robert Wilberforce about the Supremacy, but he had more ballast in his ship, and could ride the storm. In the same way it was easier for Keble than for Newman to avoid attaching undue weight to the words of individual bishops.

¹ For a contemporary judgment on this point, see an article in the *Quarterly*, 1869, on Mr. Keble's Life, by Bishop Wilberforce: "A very large proportion of the leading perverts had been bred up in the Evangelical school, and the vision of which Keble speaks of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church had dawned upon them with all the startling grandeur of a new discovery."

At first, like Newman, he inclined to do so ; but his position finally became one of ultimate appeal to the voice of the whole Church, refusing to allow that individuals could commit the Church against its will.

So what to the one man seemed destructive of the whole structure, was to the other only a consequence of the divergence between the ideal of the Church and its actual realization in this imperfect world, and, in another sphere, analogous to the discrepancy between the ideal holiness, enjoined on the members of the Church, and the realization of that holiness in their lives.

That the Catholic Church was really one, in spite of minor and external differences in no case affecting the faith of the Creeds, was, in one way or another, the corner-stone of the entire fabric of Keble's thought. As he wrote to Coleridge after Tract 90, in his unpublished letter on "Subscription to the Articles," "We have heard very little . . . of 'if a man cannot sign, let him go. If he does not like our Church, let him go to another' ; as if there were any other to which he could go." Or, again, as he put it in his letter to his brother in 1838, answering the doubts that some began to feel of Newman, "If it were not for you and Isaac,¹ I should not be made uneasy by the objections, but should account for them by supposing that people do not realize the fact

¹ Isaac Williams.

that the three Churches are really one, though divided externally." "We agree with Rome about our major premisses," he wrote to Pusey in 1836, "our differences are about the minor." It was probable that perfection lay with neither. "No doubt," he said in 1843, "we could ask Roman Catholics many questions they could not answer, and they could ask us many which we could not answer. We can only each go on in our own way, holding to the truth that we know we have." And when, in 1844, he was engaged in correspondence with Pusey over a proposed translation of the Breviary, he touched upon the folly of allowing imaginary dangers to deter the English Church from laying claim to all that was of Catholic authority. "With regard to the risk of publishing an English Breviary at all," he writes, "even in the most expurgated shape, I own I cannot well comprehend it, that is, I cannot comprehend how it should have a Romeward tendency with good sort of persons ; but to say that our Church cannot bear such a book, and that it is inconsistent with loyalty to her, this, it seems to me, *would* be a very scandalous sort of thing."

Some case connected with a school in Ireland provided him with what he described to Pusey in September, 1845, as "an instance of that which I am rather apt to dream about—a kind of neutrality between England and Rome. Both being branches of the Church, as our theory

asserts, they cannot really be enemies to each other. Neither need hesitate to educate the other's children, if need so require."

Yet neither Keble's conception of the essential and subsisting unity of the Church, nor his yearning for visible recognition of it, ever led him to think lightly of the changes of communion which these years had all too much opportunity of showing. In his eyes such a step involved the risk of setting up individual judgments, due, it might be, to ill-controlled emotions, against the dispensations of Providence. The Church in England might have her faults; the call to remain, and remove them, was but the more imperative. There were faults perhaps elsewhere. God's work must be done, where and as He has ordered it. Loyalty to the English Church would demand that those of its sons who had seen the Vision of Unity should not be deterred by apparent failures from serving it; for such were certain. At the same time, the correlation of privilege and responsibility should be insisted upon. If the Church of England claimed its share in the spiritual life of the Catholic Church, it must acknowledge the obligations which such manifold rights entailed.

But, if the principle of Catholicity was bound to introduce divergence of conclusions among those, whose range of thought was so similar as was that of Keble and Newman, it was even more certain that it must extend the gulf divid-

ing those to whom it was a law of life, and those for whom it carried little weight. Its assertion forced an answer to the question of what each man had conceived the mission of the English Church to be. The stress, that some would lay for her on Catholicity, seemed to others' eyes to imply a willingness to acquiesce blindly in all that claimed the name. On the other hand, the estimate that many of the opposing school of thought had formed of Rome, often on scanty knowledge, made it appear a matter for unqualified rejoicing that they had been released from the Roman jurisdiction. Along with this, there went an appreciation of the Reformers and of their work, which seemed to take but small account of the breach of unity involved. Statements were made on either side, without the qualifying clauses they required; words became labels, and were crudely used in different senses. There was a danger too, as always, of words assuming to themselves undue importance; but, withal, the point of view was radically different. The quarrel with Rome, causing division in the Western Church, might perhaps in the circumstances have been a necessary evil, but, as Keble pointed out in Froude's *Remains*, it must ever be a cause of sorrow for those to whom the Catholic idea meant anything. They might gratefully accept the good results which the Reformation, under God, might have effected, but they always must deplore the price exacted of the Church.

Thus all the time the gulf grew wider, and the ever-present risk of misconstruction blocked the way to general explanations.

The importance of these years is, therefore, twofold. Viewed in the general, they disclosed the difference dividing several schools of thought; for individual minds they were a period of evolution. And thus, throughout a many-sided controversy, of which they were neither the beginning nor the end, the interest is largely personal; much of it too lies round a single name.

Unconsciously, against his will, Newman had come to occupy the post of leader. By his position in the University, by his force of personality, by his power of influence, so marvellously displayed in his sermons at S. Mary's Church, he was the living representation of the ideals and hopes of one party, as of the fears and suspicions of the other. The *Apologia* has stamped contemporary impressions on the imagination of a later day, attracted by the entrancing story of a life portrayed in all its pathos of perplexity. Incidents, trivial as they might now appear, and having no ostensible connexion with each other, were yet for him the stones beside the road, marking the stages to the parting of the ways.

Throughout this critical period Keble was at Hursley, and after 1841 no longer had the duties of the Poetry Professorship to bring him into Oxford. But the anxiety that he must

naturally have felt for everything that so vitally touched the Church, was quickened by his intimacy with Newman; and, as the latter began to feel the weight of doubt more heavy, it was to Keble, more especially, that he looked for sympathy and counsel.

The danger to the Movement at the end of 1839 and in 1840 came rather from within than from events outside it. Allusion has been made to the misgivings with which Newman was regarded by a certain section among his friends. In September, 1839, he had been somewhat disturbed by an article of Dr. Wiseman on "The Anglican Succession." "The first real hit from Romanism," he described it, and hoped to have persuaded Keble to reply; but his time was fully taken up already, and Newman answered it himself.

At this time Keble was employed upon his treatise on "The Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church," which was published in 1841 as No. 89 of the Tracts. It had sprung from papers on the subject, read before the Theological Society, which met from time to time at Pusey's house in Christ Church. Its object, presumptuous as he felt the attempt to be, was to justify the temper of the early Church upon the matter. He classifies the charges brought against the Fathers under four main heads—the extravagance of the Fathers' interpretation of Scripture, their spiritual handling of the external things of nature, their

credulity about the visible intervention of Providence and of spiritual beings in the affairs of this world, and the encouragement that their principles extended to the monastic life of contemplation rather than to the social life of action. It is only with the first two that the Tract deals, and the troubles following Tract 90 prevented it from being completed. It claims authority for mystical interpretations of the Fathers from the suggestions of Holy Scripture and from the parabolic teaching of our LORD Himself. Such treatment, he argued, cannot be tried by ordinary laws of formal exegetic. It was dictated by the constant apprehension of God's Presence, finding expression in "a trembling consciousness that they were near the invisible line which separates His agency from that of His rational creatures." With this spirit of reverence and awe their writings were instinct. In this spiritual country "they were natives, and could speak the language idiomatically without stopping to recollect rules of grammar." It is a language, possibly, that we may sometimes fail to understand, but this will not necessarily prove the old interpreters to have been wrong. The objection which was often urged against the method—that it substituted allegory for the letter—lacks foundation, for the Fathers were careful to explain, with very few exceptions, that their expositions were designed to strengthen and determine, not detract from, the true meaning.

Keble also dealt with another accusation often brought against the Patristic writings, for the undue toleration extended to actions in the Old Testament of apparently questionable morality. These judgments, he held, were by no means inconsistent with the general recognition of a moral law, seeing that they were accounted for by special causes, which classed them in a different category. Chief among these would be the keen perception that early writers had of the Communion of the Saints, leading them to refrain from criticism upon those with whom they were so closely knit, and to whose labours they would feel that they had succeeded. Another was the consciousness of God's immediate Presence "overruling the Patriarchs' conduct in such a way as to make the whole a series of links binding the old dispensations to the new." And thus they would feel the greater hesitation, "by the knowledge that, for aught they could tell, God's own hand and counsel might be more or less in the things that they were blaming." Throughout, the overwhelming sense was that they were standing upon holy ground; what might to human eyes appear but the accident of chance was, in reality, to those who had the faith to see, divinely ordered. To such, external things—the knowledge of the world of sight—were but the types of that which lay behind. So, more especially, in the case of Him Who was the sum of all that had preceded and of all that

followed. "The Divinity of our LORD and His relation to mankind would cause us to feel sure that all His words and doings must be so far mystical in that they mean more, infinitely more, than meets the eye and ear of the mere human observer." *Nihil enim otiosum, neque vacuum signo, apud Deum.*

These lines of thought were sure of sympathy from Keble. They appealed to his poetical imagination. Guided and purified by reverential faith, the mystic method was the antithesis of what was so distasteful to him in the current worship of utilitarian ideas. It raised its voice against what he had termed in his preface to Hooker "the mode of thinking which inclines men to be uneasy until they have rid their Creed, as they think, as nearly as possible of all mysterious meaning."

The Tract was, in the opinion of Dean Church, inopportune, by placing yet another weapon in the hands of the opposing party. The few might understand ; but, to an age in quest of universal definition, the very sound of mysticism seemed to denote a dangerous vagueness and confusion in the minds of those who preached it.

But this was really a side issue. The main anxiety was from Wiseman's argument on the Anglican Succession. The thoughts that it had stirred in Newman's mind were not to be allowed to rest. Some of the younger men, the most prominent of whom was Ward, were

at his side, propounding questions, forcing conclusions, and inviting his assent. Grudging assent was made the starting-point from which demands were made for further logical concessions.

In this respect, Newman, it must be owned, was hardly treated fairly by his friends. He wanted time to think, to weigh his doubts, and even hoped to close his eyes to their existence ; but he was pushed along against his will by eager followers. The task of guiding and restraining all the various elements beneath his hand was one for which he was scarcely fitted ; he was too delicate and sensitive an instrument to stand the strain which it involved.

Meanwhile, the urgency of doing something to allay the restlessness of certain minds was clear, and with this object Newman set to work upon a critical examination of the Articles. His object was to remove some of the unauthorized interpretations that ignorance and prejudice had placed upon them, and to show that, taken in their literal meaning, there was nothing that need make their subscription difficult for Catholics.

This was the genesis of the famous Tract Number 90. There was little in its teaching that might not command a very general measure of acceptance ; but to those who had been nurtured in the then prevailing opinions, and to whom the idea of a unity on all essential points of faith between the English Church

and Rome was something unexpected, Newman's Tract seemed overstrained, and worse. Nor is this entirely to be wondered at. As he said himself, it was written for one set of people, and read by another. By this time too the suspicions of opponents of the Movement were more decided ; all who shared them, Puritans, Liberals, old Conservatives, Church-and-State men, even the indifferent, concurred in thinking that "something must be done." Tract 90 was the opportunity for which they had been waiting. It was published on February 27, 1841. On the following morning four Oxford Tutors met and wrote a letter condemning it, and calling on the author to disclose his name. The action of the Heads of Houses was nearly as prompt. Like other actions of that learned body, it was more remarkable for its rapidity than for its discretion. On March 12th it decided that the Tract be censured, and four days later, without waiting for any possible defence, the condemnation, with the author's name, was posted up on the Schools and in the College Butteries. Such summary procedure, Newman thought, rendered his position in Oxford almost intolerable. "It was simply an impossibility," he said, when giving the world his story of these events in the *Apologia*, "that I could say anything henceforth to good effect, when I had been posted up by the Marshal on the Buttery-hatch of every College of my University, after the manner of discommoded

pastry-cooks." Even more serious was the situation that the Tract created for Newman with his Bishop. There were long negotiations, in which Pusey acted as intermediary, and of which the upshot was that the Tracts were to be discontinued.

In all this matter Keble was directly interested. For his own part, as he told his sister, he had warmly welcomed the cause of all the uproar. Newman had sent the Tract to him in proof, and he had strongly recommended that it should be printed. In a letter to the Vice-Chancellor he took his full share of the responsibility.

As in the case of Froude's *Remains*, he was astonished at the noise that it excited, though, being removed from the actual centre of strife, he could take a more judicial view of the position. "I was very glad of it," he wrote, immediately before the censure, "judging, which was the fact, that it was written with a view to cases which Newman knew; and when I looked it over, I saw, of course, plenty which might be objected to in the old way, but nothing of much consequence, as I thought, which had not been said before. One or two points on which I individually desired suggestion I found satisfactorily explained, e.g. about General Councils, and about reserving the Eucharist; so I returned it with an *imprimatur*. . . . My feeling about it is that, if we are right in the main, their censure, if carried, will

do the cause more good than harm, and the annoyance of it to oneself will be no more than one deserves in many ways. But I hardly know how to reconcile myself to the notion of Oxford falling off from Catholicism so expressly." He gave a fuller expression to his views in a letter that he addressed to Mr. Justice Coleridge, entitled "The Case of Catholic Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles considered." It was not published at the time, but privately printed and circulated. In it he showed how gravely he viewed the situation. He vindicated the arguments put forward in the Tract, claiming, "from the whole tenor of English Church History, that this, which I will venture to go on calling the Catholic acceptance of the Articles, has been allowed by proper authorities in every generation." Latitude has been allowed on the one side ; why not on the other ? He pointed out the confusion that would result for those connected with the University if the censure should be made authoritative in Convocation. More grave, as he was soon to learn by hard experience, would be the situation of the clergy, if the example of the Heads of Houses was followed by the Bishops. The formal adoption by Church Authority of the opinions which received expression in the censure, would brand the Church in England before the rest of the Catholic world. Even without a Synodical determination, the *ex cathedra* words of Bishops would be most disquieting ;

and those affected would be compelled to choose between three courses—either to protest in such a way that the silence of the Bishop would amount to a virtual dispensation ; or to make appeal to the Metropolitan or Synod, and that publicly ; or, lastly, to contemplate retirement into lay-communion. It was probable that this last might be “the only one properly open to us.”

The Oxford censure was, however, only the beginning. In the summer of 1841 the Bishops began to charge against the Tract. Some were unsympathetic, some too were not familiar with the issues raised, but they were pressed to act. In after years Pusey recalled the conversation that he had with Newman: “What might not the Movement have been if the Bishops would have understood us ! I remember Newman saying to me at Littlemore, ‘Oh, Pusey, we have leant on the Bishops, and they have broken down under us.’ It was late then to say anything—he was already leaving us ; but I thought to myself, at least I never leant on the Bishops, I leant on the Church.”

Finally, as has been said, Keble adopted the same view about the proper weight to be attached to the expressions of individual Bishops, but his letter to Coleridge shows that at first he felt somewhat differently.

It was not long, however, before the case which he had treated, when he wrote to Coleridge, as hypothetical, became a practical one,

and his own. In July, and again in December, 1841, Bishop Sumner of Winchester refused Priest's Orders to the Rev. Peter Young, Keble's curate at Hursley, on the ground of unsound opinions about the Real Presence. Keble felt this action to be aimed almost directly at himself, and was in some perplexity how best to meet it. The Bishop's Charge in September accentuated his anxiety. On the one hand, the sentiments of the letter to Coleridge made him feel it in a way incumbent on him to resign his living; but from this he was dissuaded by his friends, and his own judgment coincided. "I have, in fact," he wrote to Newman, "rather changed my view of our position since I wrote the printed letter. . . . I now think that to resign immediately upon our Bishop's bidding, without appeal to the Metropolitan, or any one else, would be rather throwing away a safeguard which has been provided for us." He should not resign unless the Bishop called on him to do so, which was most unlikely. Instead, he hoped the Bishop would allow the matter to proceed to a legal issue. The latter was disinclined to move on either of these definite proposals, and Keble was, in the end, compelled to be content with making formal protest to the Archbishop, while he wrote again explaining his position to his own Diocesan. The dislocation of the times, and all that was involved, made it impossible to adhere too rigidly to abstract

theory. "Remember," Keble told his brother, "it is a case of quasi-heresy—which always suspends a Bishop's right to be obeyed." To the Bishop himself he wrote in similar terms: "I feel as if the present moment were of that critical kind in which it becomes every priest, even of the second order, to continue at his post, and do what trifle he can to sustain that Catholic interpretation of the English Formularies on which, from the bottom of my heart, I believe that our very being as a Church depends." The protest to the Archbishop, signed March 5, 1842, comprised a lengthy statement of the authorities for Young's expressions, and dwelt upon the danger of the Bishop's action, as an attempt to insist upon unauthorized definition of the English Formularies. If their meaning was in any reasonable doubt, it must be reached by interpreting them in consonance with the sense of Catholic Tradition.

The creation of the Jerusalem Bishopric, following Tract 90, was, for Newman, as he himself has told the world, another of the "blows" that "broke" him, and one that brought on the beginning of the end. The object of the scheme, to which the English and the Prussian Governments were parties, was to provide a Bishop at Jerusalem for the benefit of their respective countrymen in those parts. The plan received the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in October was passed by Parliament into law. The pressing need, which

was put forward to justify this experiment, was mythical. The congregation at Jerusalem to which the Bishop was avowedly to minister numbered, it was said, four persons. Furthermore, no formal abjuration of error was required from other congregations, Lutheran or Calvinist, wishing, for whatever reason, to submit themselves to his authority. It was this implied recognition of heresy that troubled Newman, and compelled him to protest to the Bishop of Oxford and to the Archbishop. Keble on general grounds agreed, but was doubtful as to the wisdom of publishing the protest, and wrote to Newman pleading for "a little expression of reverence to those whom you are censuring."

In October, 1841, the same month that the Jerusalem Bishopric was taking shape in Parliament, Keble delivered his last lecture as Poetry Professor, winding up his course, as a contemporary noted, "with a strong protest in favour of the connexion of religion and poetry." Isaac Williams, of Trinity, who was put forward by his College as a suitable successor, the accomplished author of *The Cathedral* and *The Baptistery*, combined with his poetic talent deep religious feeling. But he was connected with the Tracts, and had, quite recently, written one himself upon "Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge." The object of the Tract in question had been to inculcate the reverent handling of sacred

matters, and to protest against such over-familiar treatment of them as might tend to bring them into contempt. Keble had uttered a similar plea in his poem in *The Christian Year* for the Fourth Sunday in Lent, and, on this ground of lack of reserve, he felt compelled to criticize one for whom, with this exception, he had the deepest admiration—Sir Walter Scott.¹ Nor was the Tract an unnecessary reminder in certain quarters.

A circular of Pusey's, supporting Williams's candidature, was charged at once with introducing the religious controversy. But this was not the case. It was already there. The name by which the Tract had been given to the world had been sufficient ground with many people to condemn it, and, when added to the well-known predilections of the writer, to incite opposition. Pamphleteers supporting Mr. Garbett, his competitor, also made use of an expression of Keble's in his letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge. "Silence considerate Catholics as you may," he had written, "upon directly theological questions, how are they to deal with Ethics or Poetry or History so as not to guide their disciples by the light which the Church system reflects on all?" Pusey's intervention, however justifiable, gave the opposing party a chance, of which they were not slow to avail themselves, to assume the airs of injured innocence. Finally, the

¹ *Occasional Papers and Reviews*, p. 78.

promises received on either side were brought to a comparison of numbers, as a result of which Williams's candidature was dropped. The simple point of who should fill the Chair of Poetry had been comparatively unimportant, but the marshalling of the respective forces, and the battle-ground selected, converted this decision of withdrawal into a serious Tractarian defeat.

The contest for the Poetry Professorship was brought to an end in January, 1842. In the following June, Oxford was again the centre of another trial of strength between the parties. The signal for this was the proposal to remove the censure passed by Convocation upon Dr. Hampden in 1836. To many of the supporters of the original censure, of whom Keble was one, there seemed no ground for asking the University to revoke the opinion which had then been expressed. It was not as if the object of the censure had withdrawn anything, or even given explanations. The matter stood, as far as Dr. Hampden was concerned, exactly where it had been left six years before. If the action of 1836 were right—and it had been endorsed by an overwhelming majority of votes—the proposed repeal of 1842 was wrong.

When the abrogating Statute was brought up, Keble came to Oxford to record his vote against it, and was one of the majority.

So the censure was maintained. But the tale told by the numbers was ominous: the

censure inflicted in 1836 by 473 to 94 was only maintained in 1842 by 334 to 219. The change was unmistakable. It can partly be accounted for by commonplace considerations. The issue was not quite a clear one, arising as it did from a previous Statute which Convocation had accepted three weeks earlier, involving a general rearrangement of the theological teaching, of examinations and of their control. Again, all those who joined in the censure in 1836 did not feel equally strongly. Some might have supported it as giving a caution, some without exact or serious perception of the dangers which it was designed to meet; many would shrink from a persistently uncompromising line, which might be made to bear the character of persecution. But the deciding factor was that Rationalism no longer was the enemy that people mainly feared. In 1836 they had been glad enough to join hands with the Tractarians against it, but by this time Fortune's wheel had moved. Others were now the objects of suspicion: new elements, involving cross-divisions, had come in, and in refusing to maintain the vote of 1836 there was an opportunity of striking at the party to which, by Dr. Hampden's friends, that vote had been ascribed.

Hampden himself was the aggressor in a somewhat petty incident of this time, by attempting to exceed the powers that the Statutes gave to him as Regius Professor, in connexion

with B.D. Degrees. Candidates for these degrees were accustomed to choose their subjects, and submit theses upon them. Hampden asserted that the right of selection lay with the Regius Professor—a claim which, if adopted, would greatly have extended his powers over the writer's orthodoxy. He proceeded to require Mr. MacMullen, who was known to be in sympathy with the Tractarians, to write on two propositions condemning their theology. When eventually, and under protest, MacMullen wrote upon them, Hampden refused him his degree.

Keble greatly resented Hampden's action, and wished that the attempt might have been made with some one better known. He had thoughts about challenging the authorities by presenting himself for the degree. "I suppose," he wrote to Pusey, "it would be a bravado if I came up and took my B.D. Degree myself, and so got them to try it out in my case rather than in his?"

The following year (1843), a more direct attack was made, about which, on this ground, certainly no complaint was possible. This time the object was no other than Dr. Pusey himself. The occasion was a sermon that he preached on May 14th, before the University, on "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent." It was a careful exposition, according to his general method, of the doctrine of the Eucharist, affirming the

truth of the real objective Presence, and based upon the early Fathers of the Church and the later Anglican divines. To the astonishment of all who heard it, it soon transpired that the sermon had been delated to the Vice-Chancellor as heretical.

The action of the Six Doctors who were appointed to conduct the trial—if such it can be called—was a repetition of that of the Heads in connexion with Tract 90. They met on the strength of an ancient Statute : the defendant was condemned, unheard, to be suspended from preaching for two years ; and little explanation was ever vouchsafed by the judges of the grounds of their decision.

The unwisdom of these methods was evinced by the indignation they aroused. An address, signed by non-resident Members of Convocation—among whom was Mr. Gladstone—was presented to the Vice-Chancellor, protesting ; but all was to no purpose. Keble's name appears in this, for, although he was not sorry that the opposing party had selected so prominent a victim, he was, as he told Pusey, "really quite at a loss to imagine how they can justify their sentence without condemning almost all the writers in your *Catena*, and certainly all the Fathers."

This episode produced, in 1844, a counter-move, which, whatever may have been the merits of the case, was an unquestionable instance of mistaken tactics.

In the autumn, Dr. Wynter's term as Vice-Chancellor came to an end, and the next in order was Dr. Symons, of Wadham, one of the Six Doctors. Pusey considered that his nomination ought to be opposed, "as a protest against heresy and heretical decision." "Pusey is very earnest for this move," writes Keble to his brother. He himself was doubtful, but consented to be guided by his friends.

The event revealed the measure of the change in sympathy among the country clergy, the nomination being confirmed by almost a five to one majority. The mistake was also an expensive one, since it encouraged the University authorities to far more drastic operations in the ensuing year.

To thoughtful sympathizers with the Movement, the contrast between 1836—the year of Hampden's censure—and 1844, which saw the signal failure of the opposition to Symons, must have been a striking one. "We are getting stronger and stronger every day," writes J. B. Mozley in 1836. Eight years later the report is different. "Things look dark and dreary just now; there is a general set upon us from all quarters, Conservative and Radical. The Press never was so malignant."

The fate of Tract 90 had to a large extent defeated the object with which it had been written. Composed in the hope of giving reassurance upon some of the apparent difficulties of the Anglican system, its wellnigh

universal condemnation produced the effect in certain quarters of seriously increasing them. Newman, moreover, was gradually losing both the will and heart to control the tendency to over-zealous criticism among his younger followers, to which their appreciation of the shortcomings of the English Church was leading them. Like him, their disappointments were in proportion to the expectations they had entertained. "These men," wrote Newman in his *Apologia*, "cut into the original Movement at an angle, fell across its line of thought, and then set about turning that line in its own direction."

The older men, such as Keble and Pusey, were from time to time disturbed by articles contributed by the younger school to the *British Critic*, which was on this account discontinued. Palmer frankly parted company in his *Narrative of Events connected with the Tracts for the Times* (1843), to which, in the summer of 1844, Ward replied with a full account of his opinions in *The Ideal of a Christian Church*. With characteristic thoroughness, he showed in what respects the English Church fell short of what his dream demanded. The comparisons he drew between the Roman and the Anglican Communion lacked the judicial balance they required to make the verdict just, nor was it likely that his unqualified acceptance of the Roman system would be allowed to pass unnoticed. Few

would perhaps have been prepared to assert the absolute perfection of the Anglican system, but for the great majority Ward's conclusions and their statement were too trenchant.

It was generally supposed that the decision of the Hebdomadal Board to move was not uninfluenced by the previous opposition of the Tractarians, in the case of the Vice-Chancellorship. Accordingly, in December, 1844, it was announced that in the following February Convocation would be invited to affirm three propositions touching the matter. The first would be condemnatory of the book; the second would deprive Ward of his degrees; while the third would take the form of a test for all whose opinions on the Articles might, in future, be considered doubtful. The signatory was to affirm that he subscribed them in the sense in which he believed them to have been originally put out, and now imposed by the University.

It was the third proposal which excited the most general apprehension. Ward's friends and enemies—many even who were not strong adherents of any party, but who had some common sense—all felt the folly of the Board's suggestion. Gladstone argued on the impossibility of discovering the "sense of the first promulgation" without extensive study, and pointed out the opening which "the present sense of the University" would give to the exercise of official tyranny.

In January, 1845, Keble wrote his pamphlet,

Heads of Consideration in the Case of Mr. Ward, showing the arbitrary nature of the three proposals. Leaving on one side the question whether or not Convocation had the legal right to degrade in such a case, the character of the whole proceeding was, so Keble declared, unfair, without the justifying cause of an imperative necessity. How was it consistent with fair treatment to exercise such stern severity towards what he admitted were exaggerations on the one side, while on the other they were ignored, or even tolerated? "Indeed, it seems highly scandalous that any degree of what is called Romanizing should be visited more severely than heretical statements affecting the foundations of the Faith, the Trinity, and the Incarnation." Such action would incur the danger of driving from the Church of England many whom she could ill afford to spare.

The protest was the more weighty from the fact that Keble was not a personal friend of Ward, neither did he concur with everything that Ward had said. At the same time Keble was impressed by the sincerity with which the latter urged his strong convictions, and was incensed at "the falsehood and uncharitableness of charging him with dishonesty." The Heads, who then composed the Hebdomadal Board, were astonished at the outcry which their proposal of a test created. It was another instance, along with the procedure over Tract 90 and over Dr. Pusey's suspension, of the ill-

considered action to which the authorities were led by something very near akin to panic. They realized the hopelessness of the attempt, and decided to withdraw it. In its place, a proposition was inserted to endorse the censure they had passed upon Tract 90 four years earlier, but which, for whatever reason, had not then been submitted to Convocation.

The war of words and pens that had raged round the proposed test was now transferred to the proposed condemnation. The gratuitous attempt to utilize the odium, stimulated by Ward's book, for the revival of a bygone controversy excited keen resentment.

Newman no longer figured largely in the life of Oxford ; his influence from the University pulpit, wonderful as it had been, was now a thing of the past. He had sought the peace and obscurity of Littlemore. Wantonly to force him once again into the full glare of prejudice would be, Mr. Gladstone thought, "to treat him worse than any dog." The resolutions, however, were submitted to a crowded Convocation on February 13, 1845. The two concerned with Ward came first. Keble came up to vote against the proposals of the Heads, but found himself on each occasion one of the minority, although the degradation of Ward from his degrees received much less support than did the condemnation of his book. When the censure on the Tract came up, proceedings were suspended

by the veto of the Proctors, Mr. Guillemard and Mr. Church, with the old formula *Nobis procuratoribus non placet*.

The extensive signing of an address of gratitude, and the later failure of the attempts to bring the matter on again, showed that the Proctors had accurately gauged the feeling of the University.

Newman was personally touched by the intervention of the Proctors, but otherwise he took comparatively little interest in what was passing. Everything seemed for some time to have been tending in one direction. The fortunes of Tract 90, and the Bishops' Charges on it; the antagonism with the University into which events had driven him; his own drift of thought, affected as it was by the mental evolution of his younger friends, all combined to limit his period of hesitation.

Keble's letters of this period have been in greater part already printed, but their interest is so perennial that no sketch of Keble would without them be complete. On one point, possibly, in this connexion, a word of explanation may be given, even if it entails a slight departure from the narrative.

When, long after, Cardinal Newman presented Keble's letters to the College founded in his memory at Oxford, he prefixed a note to those of 1843 to 1845, alluding to the bitterness of self-reproach which finds expression in them. It is little wonder that these

feelings came to one for whom the wrench of 1845 was so severe. The momentary regrets with which a mere acquaintance may be ended become life-long memories in cases where the break is one of friendship. For an acquaintance can be replaced ; a friendship cannot. It remains a memory alone, and in the recollection often lies remorse. Especially was this the case with Keble. The links of love and sympathy connecting him with Newman had been more closely riveted than in the case of others, and the musings which he entertained were scarcely more than might have been anticipated, when grief and disappointment laid so rude a hand upon a nature of profound humility. His conscience troubled him for having been, as he supposed, the partial cause, even if indirect, of Newman's action. Had he been other than he was, more worthy of the office of counsellor which he had been called upon to fill, the great catastrophe might possibly have been averted. Newman, however, feared that later generations might be led to form distorted judgments of his friend on language used at such a time of trial, and therefore, with the advice of Dr. Liddon, made the erasures which will be observed in portions of the correspondence.

Throughout, as has been noticed, Keble was perhaps the friend who stood most near. He had been closely associated with Newman in the matter of Tract 90, and it was Keble who, in 1840, had persuaded Newman to continue

at S. Mary's. He thought the dangers, of which Newman was afraid, inevitable, and that in any case they would be more easily combated by Newman on the spot.

But in May, 1843, Keble at last succumbed to Newman's importunity. "It seems to me," he writes on May 3rd, "that the time is coming when there will be nothing wrong, if your own feelings prompt you to do so, as of course they must on many accounts. . . . I am not sure that I ought not to follow your example, committed as I am to the very same principles : only I do not think so much of bishops' words in their charges as you do, and as I did myself, now that I have found out how they might act upon them, and do not, thereby proving themselves not in earnest." And, again, ten days later, prompted by perfect mutual trust, he pleads more fully : "Believe me, my very dear Newman, that any thought of wilful insincerity in you can find no place in my mind. You have been, and are, in a most difficult position, and I seem to myself in some degree able to enter into your difficulties ; and although one sees, of course, how an enemy might misrepresent your continuing in the English Priesthood with such an impression on your mind, I have no thought but of love and esteem and gratitude for you in this, as in everything in this way. But I can only just say what I feel, perfectly unequal as I know myself, on every account, to give you advice on this awful

matter. My feeling is (1) that your withdrawing from the English Ministry under the present circumstances will be a very perilous step, not so much in itself, but because of its bringing you, as I fear it would in every respect, nearer to what I must call the temptation of going over ; (2) that this latter would indeed be a grievous event, considering that for what is wrong without our fault in the place where God's Providence has set us we are not ourselves answerable, but we are for what may be wrong in the position we choose for ourselves ; (3) that this difference in point of responsibility ought in a matter of practice to outweigh the difference you feel on the other side in the evidence for the claims of Rome, and against her additions to the Creed, especially as (4) you seem to ground your impression chiefly on points of *historical* evidence ; you speak of it as a 'hideous dream' from which you would gladly awake ; it does not overpower you with a sort of intrinsic lustre, as many divine truths, I suppose, might. (5) You speak in one part of your letter of our Church showing no sign of repentance, no yearning after Catholicity : but is not the time too short for any one to be acting on this impression ? Certainly there is a great yearning even after Rome in many parts of the Church, which seems to be accompanied with so much good that one hopes—if it be right—it will be allowed to gain strength. But from

bishops one could hardly look at present for more than toleration ; and that I consider even myself to have from my Diocesan ; much more you from yours. Are you sure that some of your feeling on this head is not owing to a natural reaction from having had too eager expectations at some time ? (6) I am not sure how far it is right to talk of consequences, but I suppose, as far as we can judge of them, that no one thing would tend more certainly to throw us back and undo what little good may have been done of late. As to the question itself, I am really too ignorant of the parts of history to which you refer to say a word : but can it be that the evidence seems so overpowering as to amount to moral certainty ; and, if not, ought not but a small probability on the other side to weigh against it practically ?

“You see my deep feeling about your withdrawing from your ministerial place refers almost wholly to what I fear might come after : if I were secure against such consequences, I cannot say that I should think it wrong, great as the alarm would perhaps be for a time, and the loss too, in many respects.

“One thing occurs to me. Do you not think it possible that you may have overestimated the claims of Rome in your later studies, from a kind of feeling that your earlier expressions had done her wrong ; and now that you have retracted them, would it not be well

to examine the matter over again, free as you would be from that particular bias?

“And now, my dearest Newman, I have one more earnest request to make of you—that you will not in the smallest degree depend on my advice or opinion in this matter, for you do not, you cannot . . . [erasure] . . . to advise with about it, in *every respect* but true love (I believe) towards you. It frightens me to think how rashly, and with how small preparation, I have been dealing with these great matters, and I have all manner of imaginations as to how my defects may have helped to unsettle people, and in particular to hinder you from finding peace. Yet, do not suppose I would stop you from writing to me if it is the least relief to you to do so. On the contrary, not to hear from you would be a sad loss. All I want is that you should put no sort of implicit faith in me, but take up with what I say when you see anything in it that is reasonable and right, not otherwise.

“I still cling to the hope you taught me to entertain, that in the present distress, where the Succession and the Creeds are, there is the Covenant, even without visible inter-Communion.

“God forgive, and bless us, and choose our burthen for us, and help us to bear it; and if it be His Will, may we two never be divided in Communion.

“Ever your most grateful and affectionate,

“J. KEBLE.”

On May 30, 1843, while warning Newman against the risk of intellectual restlessness, he admits that "on the whole, my leaning is towards your retiring as quietly as you can"; and, in September, Newman resigned S. Mary's.

Again and again his letters to Newman referred to the overwhelming need for steady patience and humility, and to the thought that uncertainty might be for some the peculiar form of trial which was ordered. "You might well believe," he tells Newman on July 29, 1843, "that I have been full of thoughts about you. . . . Sometimes I think it would be good for one to withdraw as much as possible for awhile from Theological study and correspondence. . . . Again, I think that unreserved confidence in some *really worthy* confessor might be a great help to you at times: I mean the sort of submission that would make you put by a subject if he bid you, without his assigning any reason. . . ."

But Lockhart's going to Rome in August, after having entered Newman's house at Littlemore a year before, under a pledge of taking no decisive step for three years, made such mental isolation difficult, and Keble felt his insufficiency for the task that friendship had imposed. "I quite thirst after some other counsel for you," he writes in September; and Pusey's recovery from ill-health leads to the suggestion that Newman should "impart some at least of the case to him."

On January 22, 1844, he returns to the endeavour that was so engrossing : " My very dear Newman, I think, and think, and it seems all to no purpose : for when I come to set it down it will be only telling you over again what you have yourself told me and others. These are some of my impressions :—First, I feel more strongly with every month's, week's, day's experience, the danger of tempting God, of the deep responsibility I should have to bear were I to forsake this Communion ; and yet, with the same lapse of time, one seems to feel more and more the truth and beauty and majesty of so much which they have, and we seem at least to have not. Secondly, one is at times very, very strongly impressed with the thought of the Evil One, how surely he would endeavour to ruin the good work, supposing it begun, in the English Church, by laying hold of any undiscerned weakness or ill-tendency in the agents to entice or drive them out of it ; such tendencies one can imagine in your case—among the rest, a certain restlessness, a longing after something more, a something analagous to a very exquisite ear in music which would keep you, I should think, in spite of yourself, intellectually and morally dissatisfied wherever you were. If you were in a convent you would be forced to subdue it, and, as it were, swallow it down ; may it not perhaps be your calling now to do the same, though under no such definite rule, for others'

sake as well as your own? May it not be your duty, according to your own line of argument just made public, to suppress your misgivings, nay, what seem your intellectual convictions, as you would any other bad thought, making up your mind that the conclusion is undutiful, and therefore there must be some delusion in the premises? Another thought one has is of the utter confusion and perplexity, the astounding prostration of heart and mind into which so many would be thrown were their guide and comforter to forsake them all at once, in the very act, as it would seem to them, of giving them directions which they most needed. I really suppose that it would be to *thousands* quite an indescribable shock, a truth almost too hard to be borne, making them sceptical about everything and everybody. Surely, when it is a person's duty (as S. Paul's) to take such a step as that, the tokens from above will be such (one naturally expects) as no one could mistake; and may we not piously believe that when it is the will of Divine Providence that such persons as Pusey, for example, should leave their present Communion, something equivalent to that voice will occur—such as an *unequivocal* act of heresy on the part of our Church, leaving no doubt on the mind; and that till such tokens are given, it is His will men should stay where they are?

“I am running on, I fear, not very wisely,

and I wish I may not be distressing you ; but if I could express myself better, I believe I really mean what I have learned from yourself . . . I am writing in great ignorance, and very likely quite beside the mark ; if I pain or disturb you, forgive me. Somehow or other I was almost forced to write. You know I see you looking at me day after day, and I *must* speak to you now and then, and when I speak I must say what is in my mind. May it do no harm, if it does no good. I am sure my account is heavy enough without that.

“Ever and ever, I hope, your affectionate and grateful

“J. K.”

These efforts are the more affecting, if it is remembered that their writer must have realized for some time previously that, speaking humanly, they were foredoomed to failure. “My grand swallow of pain,” so he consoles, on March 3, 1844, the one who was the unwilling cause of it, “was perhaps three-quarters of a year ago when I received a long letter of yours, and retired into a dirty old chalk-pit to read it. I cannot tell you with what sort of fancy I look at the place now.”

The reading of Arnold's *Life*, in June, 1844—the friend of undergraduate days of Corpus—recalled the bitter burden of responsibility, as he conceived, so ill-discharged : “Both in respect of Arnold and of your change—not that I mean to compare the two subjects

in the least degree in point of distressfulness—but in both one has a sad, depressing thought that if one were, or had been, other than one is, the anguish might have been averted or mitigated.”

To similar arguments and feelings he gave expression a few days later (June 12th): “You will easily imagine how dissatisfied I am with every word I write to you, and will excuse one’s fidgeting and continually adding more ‘last words.’ . . . Do you not think it possible (I daresay I borrow the view from yourself) that the whole Church may be so lowered by sin as to hinder one’s finding on earth anything which seems really to answer to the Church of the Saints; and will it not be well to prepare yourself for disappointment, lest you fall into something like scepticism? You know I have always fancied that, perhaps, you were over-sanguine in making things square, and did not quite allow enough for Bishop Butler’s notion of doubt and intellectual difficulty being some men’s intended element and appropriate trial. The other thing I wanted to say to you, or rather to make you feel, was of one of your friends at least—and he believes a great many would be of the same mind—that nothing which may happen will make any kind of separation or hinder confidence.” In November, 1844, he tries to comfort him by telling him of the numbers that looked to him with loving gratitude: “My dear Newman,

do not in any case imagine that you have not hundreds, not to say thousands, sympathizing with you, and feeling indeed that they owe their very salvation to you. I can only speak for *one* of certain knowledge. . . . Wherever I go there is some one to whom you have been a channel of untold blessing. They have had unspeakable help from you, and it is now their turn to help you with their prayers and good wishes. . . .”

The solicitude on the one side was met with unreserved confidence on the other. In 1843 Newman had insisted upon Keble seeing his private journal, and in December, 1844, he writes: “Some time ago I wrote down for Keble everything of every sort I could detect as passing in my mind in any respect wrong, or leading to wrong, day by day for an actual period, and he could detect nothing bearing on this particular belief of mine. I have been as open with him as possible.”

After the passing of a letter on the occasion of Newman’s birthday in February, 1845, the correspondence lapses until it is resumed and closed by a letter of October, the longest and most touching of the series:

“*October 3, 1845.*

“MY DEAR NEWMAN,

“I feel as if I had something to say to you, although I do not very well know what it will be; but Charlotte’s illness having, for

the present at least, abated, I find that I am better able than I have been for over a fortnight past to think and speak coherently of other things ; and what can I think of so much as you, dear friend, and the *ἀγωνία* which awaits us with regard to you : except, indeed, when my thoughts travel on to Bisley to Tom's bedside ; for there, as well as here, everything almost seems to have been, perhaps to be, hanging by a thread. At such times one seems in a way to see deeper into realities, and I must own to you, that the impression on my own mind of the reality of the things I have been brought up among, and of its being my own fault, not theirs, whereinsoever I am found wanting, this impression seems to deepen in me as death draws nearer, and I find it harder and harder to imagine that persons, such as I have seen and heard of lately, should be permitted to live and die deceiving themselves on such a point as whether they are aliens to the grace of God's Sacraments or no.

“ *October 11th, Midnight.*—I had written thus far about a week ago, and then left off for very weariness, and now that I am thinking of going on with my writing, I find that the thunderbolt has actually fallen upon us, and you have actually taken the step which we greatly feared. I will not plague you, then, with what I might otherwise have set down—something which passed directly relating to yourself in what fell from my dear wife on this day fortnight, when,

in perfect tranquillity and self-possession, having received the Holy Communion, she took leave of us all, expecting hourly to sink away. By God's great mercy she revived, and still continues among us, with, I trust, increasing hopes of recovery ; but the words which she spoke were such that I myself always think of them as of the last words of a saint. Some of them I had thought of reporting to you, but this at any rate is not the time.

“Wilson has told me how kindly you have been remembering us in our troubles ; it was very kind, when you must have so much upon your own mind. Who knows how much good your prayers, and those of other absent friends, may have done us, both here and at Bisley ? For there too, as I dare say you know, has been a favourable change, and a more decided one, I imagine, than here—at least their doctor has told them they may make themselves comfortable, which is far beyond anything that has yet been said to us. But his recovery is very, very slow. There too, as well as here, everything has fallen out so as to foster the delusion, if delusion it be, that we are not quite aliens, not living among unrealities. Yet you have no doubt the other way. It is very mysterious, very bewildering indeed ; but being so, one's duty seems clearly pointed out—to abide where one is till some new call come upon one. If this were merely my own reason or feeling, I should mistrust it altogether, knowing, alas !

that I am far indeed from the person to whom guidance is promised ; but when I see the faith of others, such as I know them to be, and so very near to me as GOD has set them, I am sure that it would be a kind of impiety but to dream of separating from them.

“Besides the deep grief of losing you for a guide and helper, and scarce knowing which way to look—though I trust, thanks (in good part) to your kindness in many ways, I am not in so wretched a condition as I was—you may guess what uncomfortable feelings haunt me, as if I, more than any one else, was answerable for whatever of distress and scandal may occur. I keep on thinking, ‘If I had been different, perhaps N. would have been guided to see things differently, and we might have been spared so many broken hearts and bewildered spirits.’ To be sure, that cold, hard way of going on, which I have mentioned to you before, stands my friend at such times, and hinders me, I suppose, from being really distressed ; but this is how I feel that I ought to feel, and . . . [erasure] . . . I tell you . . . [erasure] . . . and how I wish you to help me. That way of help, at any rate, is not forbidden you in respect of any one of us.

“My dear Newman, you have been a kind and helpful friend to me, in a way in which scarce any one else could have been, and you are so mixed up in my mind with old and dear and sacred thoughts that I cannot well bear to

part with you, most unworthy as I know myself to be : and yet I cannot go along with you. I must cling to the belief that we are not really parted—you have taught me so, and I scarce think you can unteach me. And having relieved my mind with this little word, I will only say God bless you, and reward you a thousandfold for all your help in every way to me unworthy, and to so many others. May you have peace when you are gone, and help us in some way to get peace ; but somehow I scarce think it will be in the way of controversy. And so with somewhat of a feeling as if the spring had been taken out of my year,

“ I am always your affectionate and grateful,

“ J. KEBLE.”

The epilogue, though dated nearly twenty years later, may be given here :

“ *August 4, 1863.*

“ MY DEAR NEWMAN,

“ It is a great thing, I know, for me to ask after so many years, that you should look kindly upon what comes from me. For I cannot conceal it from myself, nor yet acknowledge it without a special sort of pang that . . . your feeling . . . as to your old friends' silence touches me perhaps as much or more than any, and it is one of the many things which, now in my old age, I wish otherwise. I ought to have felt more than I did what a sore burden you were bearing for conscience

sake, and that it was the duty of us all to diminish rather than aggravate it so far as other claims allowed. . . . It frightens me now to think how nearly the time has passed away. I can but ask that, if I have been towards you too much as if you had been dead, you will now be towards me as if I were dying—which, of course, must be nearly my condition ; for, though (D.G.) wonderfully well, I am in my 72nd year. . . . And now, my dear Newman, let me say ‘God be with you, and may He forgive and bring us all together, as He will, and when He will.’ I know that you will let me have a line or two to say that you will believe me still and always, yours affectionately,

“J. KEBLE.”

So terminated, in 1845, the struggle in the Valley of decision. To some among the bystanders, the story and its outcome was a mystery to which for them experience could give no key. Others might pride themselves upon their prescience in anticipating the result, oblivious of the extent to which their early prophecies, cruel beyond their knowledge, had secured their own fulfilment. But to those who had been privy to the agonizing struggle of a soul, there was but little feeling of surprise, still less of bitterness, as comes to men betrayed ; but only one of self-reproach, intensely sad.

CHAPTER IV

THE POET

IMPORTANT though Keble's share was in the events recorded in the previous chapter, it is through his poetry that his name is most familiar to many of the present generation.

On that aspect of his character something may now be said.

The poetic temper, in those who have it, must always represent a part of that sum of thought and of experience—the contact of a mind with men and things—that goes to make up life. But with Keble it was something more than this. It moulded his life, and in return was moulded by it. His imagination freely exercised itself upon the good things of sight and sound, receiving gladly in exchange whatever they might give.

It is not necessary to venture far upon the path of criticism. That path has been already wisely trodden by those possessed of greater skill,¹ and it will here suffice to notice briefly some of the more distinctive features of that

¹ *John Keble*, by Walter Lock, chapters ii and iii; Principal Shairp's Essay on Keble in *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*.

poetry to which Keble's mind by nature turned so readily.

The fame of Keble as a poet reposes on three small volumes. *The Christian Year* itself is a small collection of short thoughts in verse; the *Lyra Innocentium* is of equally unpretentious size; this, with the *Miscellaneous Poems*, posthumously collected, is the sum of the poetry that Keble left.

Besides these remains, however—and of value as containing his own opinion of the Art of Poetry—there are the Lectures he delivered at Oxford as Poetry Professor (1832-41); also a few Reviews on allied subjects, published at different times in periodicals.¹

The *Prælectiones* are, as the University Statute then directed, in Latin—a misfortune that hitherto no translator has been bold enough to remedy. It is easy to see that Keble moved freely in the Latin tongue: the style is delicate, and the subject is enlivened by frequent flashes of sprightly humour; yet no man can expect to be on the same terms with a foreign language as with his own; and, for this reason, the statutory limitation must have hampered the lecturer in the free handling of his subject, while it has certainly prevented his work from being as widely known as might otherwise have been the case. In his early teaching, Keble's father had accustomed him

¹ Collected in *Occasional Papers and Reviews*, to which references are here given.

to the practice of mental concentration, and these lectures were frequently composed upon slips of paper, written upon the edge of the mantelpiece in the drawing-room at Hursley, amid what would to the ordinary mind have been the distractions of music and conversation.

The fullest exposition of Keble's theory of Poetry is contained in the *Prælectiones*; in a shorter form it can be studied in the Review of Lockhart's *Life of Sir Walter Scott*.¹

His theory of Poetry and his poems alike bear witness to the influence of the Romantic revival which coincided with his early boyhood,² and with the reaction from the superficial and conventional style and treatment of the eighteenth century Keble was in the most complete accord.

As to its origin, poetry for Keble represents the outcome of struggling thoughts, for the expression of which prose is inadequate. Poetic utterance, to which at such times the poet has recourse, serves as a safety-valve for pent-up feelings. The partial disclosure

¹ *Occasional Papers and Reviews*, p. 1.

² Cf. dedication of *Prælectiones Academicæ* :

"Viro vere philosopho
et vati sacro
Gulielmo Wordsworth
cui illud munus tribuit
Deus Opt. Max.

Ut, sive hominum affectus caneret,
Sive terrarum et cæli pulchritudinem,
Legentium animos semper ad sanctiora erigeret."

of these emotions, by means of words, should nevertheless be duly subject to some control or reserve, which it is the function of the laws of cadence and rhythm to supply.

The true poet, then, will be one who expresses some feeling of the heart, which without that expression would remain inarticulate ; he gives shape to thoughts and longings, which, but for him, would lack interpretation.

Further than this, poets may often reveal to their readers the existence of feelings, of which before they had been only dimly conscious, or whose very existence, it may be, they had not suspected. What the poet does with language is alike the privilege, in their respective spheres, of painter and musician.

The field open to true poetic treatment is comprehensive, therefore, as the range of human aspirations. Individual character will be inclined to treat of one subject rather than another ; time and circumstances will play their part in the selection. But, underlying all, however varying the conditions, it is with unchanging truths that poets are concerned.

And, just for this, the appeal inherent in true poetry is permanent and universal.

Judged by this test, poets can be divided into "Primary" and "Secondary." The former are impelled to write by an instinct, deep, commanding, irresistible ; the latter, who are driven by no such overpowering instinct, have consciously perfected themselves in the

art that for the former is spontaneous and unlearned. They may be clever literary craftsmen, and it is even open to these to be great poets ; but they can never take their place by the side of those who have been made by nature. *Poeta nascitur non fit*. A modern epigram has divided public speakers into the two classes of those who have something to say, and those who have to say something. Such, if the transference of language may be pardoned, is in rough outline Keble's reading of the poet's art. This point of view, in which emphasis is laid upon the responsibility of those to whom such powers have been entrusted, may be illustrated from the opening lines of the poem for Palm Sunday in *The Christian Year*. He is addressing those who have heard the call of Poetry :

“Ye whose hearts are beating high
With the pulse of Poesy,
Heirs of more than royal race,
Framed by Heaven's peculiar grace,
God's own work to do on earth.”

In the *Prælectiones* this theory is illustrated by a very full examination of the classical poets. Homer, Pindar, Aeschylus, Euripides, among the Greeks ; Virgil and Lucretius among the Latins, may all be said to show some strong directing impulse which substantiates their claim to be included in the ranks of primary poets. In his reviews Keble passes interesting judgment upon some of the English writers. Shakespeare, of course, stands alone for his

insight and appreciation of the affections by which mankind is stirred. Of Sir Walter Scott he writes: "It is not, perhaps, too much to say that never did any single writer exercise a greater influence on his age . . ." and this not only in the field of literature. "Whatever of good feeling and salutary prejudice exists in favour of ancient institutions, and in particular the sort of rally which this kingdom has witnessed during the last three years" (1835-8), "not to say the continuance of the struggle at all through the storm of the preceding—is it not in good measure attributable to the chivalrous tone which his writings have diffused over the studies and tastes of those who are now in the prime of manhood?"¹

Of sacred poets, it is to Spenser that, "upon the whole, the English reader must revert, as being, pre-eminently, the sacred poet of his country." He is ever "by a silent preference, everywhere inculcating the love of better and more enduring things—and so most exactly fulfilling what he has himself declared to be 'the general end of all his book'—'to fashion a gentleman, or noble person, in virtuous and gentle discipline.'"²

The "shrinking delicacy" of Spenser, when handling sacred subjects, provides a striking contrast to the outspokenness of Milton. Yet this quality in the latter's writings was the result of his own temper, and of that of the

¹ *Life of Sir Walter Scott*, p. 67. ² *Sacred Poetry*, p. 107.

times in which his lot was cast. And, modifying the unfavourable verdict of undergraduate days,¹ Keble now admits that these blemishes "do not affect his claim to be considered the very lodestar and pattern of that class of sacred poets in England."²

In one respect, however, sacred poetry stands on a somewhat different footing from that of a more general character. Partaking as it does in great degree of the nature of a devotional meditation, it is scarcely fair, or possible, to judge it by the strict canon of literature. That is to say, the critic will not be justified in the exclusive application of certain accepted principles of art, to that which in part reposes upon other considerations. The devotional feeling in the reader, to which appeal is made, may be obscured and dull, rendering him but poorly qualified to apprehend the picture that the poet would portray.

Such shortly is Keble's position with regard to poetry. It will be less difficult now to arrive at some conclusion as to how far he conforms to his own standard.

In point of time and popularity, *The Christian Year* holds priority of place among Keble's work.

The poems were composed between 1819 and 1827, with no thought of publication, at any rate within the writer's lifetime. Keble was most averse to the surrendering of thoughts so intimate and sacred to the common gaze.

¹ *Vide supra*, ch. i, p. 9.

² *Sacred Poetry*, p. 104.

And thus, when, in 1827, he ultimately yielded to the strong wishes of his father, and to the entreaties of his friends, by publishing, he preferred to withhold his name ; and, to the end of his life, *The Christian Year* was a subject to which, in the presence of the author, no reference was permitted.

The advertisement to the volume outlines the modest purpose of its publication. After stating that "next to a sound rule of faith, there is nothing of so much consequence as a sober standard of feeling in matters of practical religion," it makes allusion to that "soothing tendency of the Prayer Book which it is the chief purpose of these pages to exhibit."

As might have been anticipated, the poems have been affected by the conditions of their production.

The desire to provide appropriate hymns for every Holy Day in the Church's year is exposed to two very obvious practical dangers. There may either be a tendency to strain the occasion to fit some poetic thought, or, on the other side, the thought, that is evoked to fill a certain niche in a literary scheme, may sometimes appear fanciful, and savour of having been produced for the occasion. For these reasons, among others, the poems are not equal, and some are decidedly obscure. To be fully appreciated they must be familiarly known ; but even to be judged intelligently, they must be viewed with reference to the atmosphere that gave them birth.

Readers will appraise, according to their sympathies and predilections, the constituent elements of Keble's teaching as delivered in his poetry.

In the case of one, the mind will contemplate more deeply the relationship of man to God; to another, the commanding feature will rather be the mysterious intimacy between the soul of man and nature. But, in its widest sense, Keble's teaching embraces each.

For it is of man himself, set midway between God and Nature, that Keble writes. Man's soul is for ever straining to lay hold of something outside and beyond itself. However reluctantly he may accept it, the conviction is borne in upon him that from the world of sense he can derive no lasting comfort. The finite cannot satisfy a craving for the infinite. And when man turns to God, he finds no stranger, but a brother and a friend. One Who has loved him and taught him how to love in turn: One Who has suffered and triumphed for him, and now remains, in His Church and through His Sacraments, to solace grief, to strengthen doubts, to soothe remorse, and to shed light in the dark places of the world.

Illuminated by this vision:

“Our throes should be forgot, or only seem
Like a sad vision told for joy at morn,
For joy that we have waked and found it but a dream.”

The constant recollection of God's Presence

will consecrate man's daily life, and lift his mind to worthier thoughts about his fellows :

“If on our daily course our mind
Be set to hallow all we find,
New treasures still, of countless price,
God will provide for sacrifice.”

Love is the master-key :

“Even so, who loves the LORD aright,
No soul of man can worthless find ;
All will be precious in his sight,
Since CHRIST on all hath shined.”

But if GOD's goodness and man's privileges are thus immeasurable, so that their meaning can be at the best but feebly realized, there is the greater need of humility and of untiring perseverance, in order to defeat the soul-destroying work of sin :

“So like an Angel's is our bliss
(Oh ! thought to comfort and appal !),
It needs must bring, if used amiss,
An Angel's hopeless fall.”

Yet, while on the one side man has been endowed with the faculty of drawing near to GOD in the spiritual world, so he has much to learn from Nature. Here again sin blocks the view. Much as we are enabled, even by the light of human wisdom, to discern of the ordered mystery of natural phenomena, these are but the symbols, the outward shadowing forth in visible form, of those invisible realities, which

lie behind them, and of which we are generally unconscious :

“Two worlds are ours : ’tis only Sin
Forbids us to descry
The mystic heaven and earth within,
Plain as the sea and sky.”

The world of nature is full of message to this nature-loving poet. Impressed with her wonders, he exclaims :

“Mine eye unworthy seems to read
One page of Nature’s beauteous book.”

In fact “Nature’s beauteous book” is perpetually enforcing and illustrating the poet’s teaching. The “duteous heed,” with which the earth attends to the treasures of seed entrusted to her care, is a standing rebuke to man’s careless disregard of the lavish gifts that God bestows upon him. The resignation of the falling leaves in autumn, which have no future, contrasts strangely with the perverse repining of man. Prayer the poet compares with the mountain stream, developing into a river, destined, perhaps, at last in some great ocean to share in carrying the navies of the world. True love is

“the flower that closes up for fear
When rude and selfish spirits breathe too near.”

Numerous, too, are the isolated thoughts, cherished of early memory, that passing occasion

may recall. Here, for instance, he touches on human loneliness :

“Why should we faint and fear to live alone,
 Since all alone, so Heaven has will'd, we die,
 Nor even the tenderest heart, and next our own,
 Knows half the reasons why we smile and sigh?”

Again, on the mountain the sounds to which
 the traveller listens are

“Such sounds as make deep silence in the heart,
 For Thought to do her part.”

Or, mark how skilfully the imagination is
 directed to the languid stillness of a hot
 summer's day !

“Deep is the silence as of summer noon,
 When a soft shower
 Will trickle soon,
 A gracious rain, freshening the weary bower—
 O sweetly then far off is heard
 The clear note of some lonely bird.”

In the lines upon the Burial of the Dead,
 there is comfort for many :

“’Tis sweet, as year by year we lose
 Friends out of sight, in faith to muse
 How grows in Paradise our store.”

The favour, with which *The Christian Year*
 was immediately received in the outside world,
 was evidence that the verse rang true. During
 its author's lifetime, no less than ninety-five
 editions of the book were called for—a number
 that by the end of the year following his death
 had been increased to a hundred and nine.
 That it is so essentially a human book is the

secret of its popularity. Its appeal, if confined on the one side by its sacred character and by its ecclesiastical significance, is surely extended on the other by the sympathy with all human things by which it is pervaded.

The practical necessity of raising money for the rebuilding of Hursley Church induced Keble to publish, in 1846, the poems, which at intervals he had been writing for the last five years. At first he had intended to publish them as a *Christian Year* for children : but the title under which they finally appeared was that of *Lyra Innocentium : Thoughts in verse on Christian children, their ways and privileges*.

In many ways the *Lyra* differs from *The Christian Year*. There are things in it of a finer quality than anything to be found in the earlier collection, and some have preferred it as a whole. A departure is made from the arrangement of *The Christian Year* — poems being classified according to their subjects rather than by their place in the Church's year. A more substantial difference is the diminished use that the poet makes of Nature. Her resources, it is true, with all the wealth of imagery that they suggest, are still employed, but with this difference : in *The Christian Year*, the thoughts of Nature force their way into the verses by virtue of their own compelling charm. The poet of Nature loves her simply ; and in so doing feels the pure *joie de vivre*, which makes him write of her. In the *Lyra*

this feeling is restrained. Here, Nature is introduced, for the most part, as a conscious contributor to a definite purpose, that the poet has before his eyes. She is useful, in so far as she can emphasize his teaching. Another very obvious contrast must at once suggest itself. This is the presence in the *Lyra Innocentium*, far more strongly marked than in the earlier volume, of that which for want of a better word has been termed "ecclesiastical significance." It is true that this characteristic has commended the book to those for whom Keble was chiefly writing ; but, at the same time, it has certainly precluded it from the attainment of the wider popularity of its predecessor.

But these features are the reflection of the times in which the verses were composed.

Throughout *The Christian Year* Keble had viewed the Church in England, to use his own words, as "in a state of decay." But, just at the moment when it was being rescued by the revival dating from 1833, had come the crisis of the struggle, personified in Newman and culminating in 1845.

The dominant interest of the time, for all involved in these events, was how far the Church of England could rightly claim their allegiance. And although there might be many, Keble among the number, who never doubted in their answer to this question, yet the mere fact that it had been raised, thereby bringing grief and separation, would serve to

quicken their devotion to it. Brought thus, by sorrowful experience, to appreciate the treasure in the Church's keeping, they must feel bound to introduce the knowledge of that treasure into the lives of others. Yet, had it not been for the necessity thus laid upon them, many might have felt the task beyond their power. Throughout the *Lyra Innocentium*, especially in the Preface, Keble is labouring with the double thought—the necessity of utterance, his own unworthiness to utter. To such the sweets of human praise are bitter :

“And, ah ! to him what tenfold woe,
Who hides so well his sin,
Through earth he seems a saint to go,
Yet dies impure within !

“Pray we our LORD, one pang to send
Of deep remorseful fear
For every smile of partial friend.—
Praise be our Penance here !”

In the wider world, moreover, the full presentment of the Christian's privileges is marred by the all-pervading and tainting touch of sin. Only in little children have these noxious influences as yet no place :

“JESUS, in His babes abiding
Shames our cold ungentle ways.”

It is, accordingly, to children that Keble would direct the attention of those in need of practical example and encouragement :

“Be thou through life a little child,
By manhood undefil'd.”

Children will prove the best interpreters of the opportunities of grace that the Church affords, and, by their affectionate lightheartedness, their ready sympathy, their simple trust, will teach their elders how to use them aright. Man's customary ingratitude to God perpetually stands rebuked before the simple thankfulness of children :

“Babes and Angels grudge no praise :—
But elder souls, to whom His saving ways
Are open, fearless take
Their portion, hear the Grace, and no meek
answer make.”

There is a lesson too in the anxious care that these young gardeners lavish upon the little plot of ground with which they are allowed to play :

“Is not a life well-spent
A child's play-garden, lent
For Heaven's high trust to train young heart
and limb ?”

So therefore :

“To Him our song we pour
Who lent us Earth, that He might give us
Heaven at last.”

Keble has told us how cherished was the consolation that these thoughts of children gave :

“More than we know, and all we need,
Is in young children's prayer and creed.”

And his mind reverts lovingly to that perpetual

type of simple faith set in a world where faith was dull :

“Give me a tender spotless child,
Rehearsing or at eve or morn
His chant of glory undefil’d,
The Creed that with the Church was born.”

Of the *Miscellaneous Poems*, although the last to see the light in book form, many had been published at much earlier date.

Before the beginning of the Movement, Keble had assisted with the series of short poems appearing under the title of “*Lyra Apostolica*,” in the pages of the *British Magazine*. The larger number of these were Newman’s ; Bowden, Hurrell Froude, and Isaac Williams also shared the work ; but, after Newman, Keble was the main contributor, under the signature of “*γ*.” These verses most truly indicate what was the mind of their composers upon the nature of the work that lay before them, and upon the spirit in which that work must be approached. The work was to stem the rising tide of Liberalism, expressed before their eyes in the universal and demoralizing worship of the utilitarian principle. Nor was this principle devoid of concrete shape in the world of politics. The Whig Reformers, confident in the omnipotence of their philosophy, made no concealment of their intention to extend its operation to the Church. In the struggle that was imminent, no one could be exempt from taking part ; for

to all would come the necessity of making choice between fighting for the Church, or for the Church's enemies.

With some exceptions, of which the most conspicuous are Keble's translation of the Greek evening hymn, "Hail, gladdening light," and, for different reasons, his ode to the winter thrush, beginning,

"Sweet bird ! up earliest in the morn,
Up earliest in the year,"

the general mood of these early poems is that of a sharp call to arms.

Although there was much, when they were written, to accentuate the contrast between the ideal of the Church, and the actual form in which she was presented to men, there is nothing but defiance in the challenge proffered to

"the ruffian band
Come to reform, where ne'er they came to pray."

At the same time, the loyal adherents of the Church are called upon in clear and ringing tones to arm themselves in her defence. Stern and decisive is the summons, closing the door to any unworthy compromise with the forces of the world :

"One only Way to life :
One Faith, delivered once for all ;
One holy Band, endow'd with Heaven's high call ;
One earnest, endless strife :
This is the Church th' Eternal framed of old.

“Smooth open ways, good store ;
A Creed for every clime and age,
By Mammon’s touch new moulded o’er and o’er ;
No cross, no war to wage ;
This is the Church our earth-dimm’d eyes behold.

“But ways must have an end,
Creeds undergo the trial-flame,
Nor with th’ impure the Saints for ever blend,
Heaven’s glory with our shame :—
Think on that hour, and choose ’twixt soft and bold.”

In addition to these, there are included in this volume several hymns, translated or composed for the Salisbury Hymnal, and also a variety of sonnets, apparently written on the prompting of the moment, upon any subject that might happen to suggest itself.

Of the other poems in this book many would probably deserve some notice, but it is only necessary to make brief reference to one, and this on account of a special interest attaching to it.

This poem, the “Mother out of sight,” was written for the *Lyra Innocentium*, but withheld, upon the advice of certain among Keble’s friends, from publication, for fear of the offence it might occasion. While prepared to acquiesce in their considered judgment, he only did so with reluctance ; and it is difficult to see in what respect the poem went beyond what he had previously written in the verses upon “Orphanhood.” In these verses he consoles the orphan for her mother’s loss, by the reminder that in

heaven she has "a holier Mother, rapt in more prevailing prayer." This, in the "Mother out of sight," is amplified as follows :

"How, but in love on thine own days,
Thou blissful one, upon thee gaze?
Nay every day, each suppliant hour,
Whene'er we kneel in aisle or bower,
Thy glories we may greet unblamed,
Nor shun the lay by seraphs framed,
'Hail, Mary, full of grace!' O, welcome sweet
Which daily in all lands all saints repeat !

"Fair greeting, with our matin vows
Paid duly to the enthroned Spouse,
His Church and Bride, here and on high,
Figured in her deep purity,
Who, born of Eve, high mercy won,
To bear and nurse the Eternal Son.
O, awful station, to no seraph given,
On this side touching sin, on the other heaven !

"Therefore, as kneeling day by day
We to our FATHER duteous pray,
So unforbidden may we speak
An Ave to CHRIST'S Mother meek :
(As children with 'good morrow' come
To elders in some happy home :)
Inviting so the saintly host above
With our unworthiness to pray in love."

At the beginning of the chapter, the question was propounded whether Keble could be rightly said to satisfy the requirements of his own poetic canon. If ever poet was, he certainly was conscious of an overmastering emotion. Not only, or even chiefly, was its outlet in his poetry, but, as will be seen, it left

no portion of his life uncoloured. This feeling was that of reverence : reverence for God, for man, for nature—for God by reason of what He is ; for man and nature by reason of what He has made them. And as he would by lowly reverence discern God in all His visible works, so reverence and purity are required if a man is to enter into the deeper mysteries, which God has partially revealed. Their treasures are not for those who would make human reason the measure of their faith. The concrete facts of the physical world, although they are the ordinary currency of daily life, are only a part of man's experience ; and there is a certainty which it is not in their power to give. The mathematical tables are of small avail when the reckoning is concerned with eternity.

Of these limitations Keble was profoundly conscious. At all times, not least in *The Christian Year*, he protests against the tendency to measure faith by sight :

“Choose to believe, not see : sight tempts the heart
From sober walking in true Gospel ways.”

He is perpetually attempting to recall men's minds to the truths that lie behind, and that are none the less true because they are unseen, and not susceptible of scientific demonstration.¹

¹ Newman's letter to his mother : “Keble's book is full of such truths, which any Cambridge man may refute with the greatest ease.”—*Letters of J. H. Newman*, vol. i, p. 206.

Too scanty justice has been done to the quality of Keble's poetry ; yet, sharing as it does the privileged position of hymns, the ordinary canons of criticism are scarcely relevant, and do not affect its permanence.

With some words of one of Keble's greatest friends this sketch may be concluded : ¹

" If there is one quality which more than another may be said to mark his writings, it is their intense and absolute *veracity*. Never for a moment is the very truth sacrificed to effect. I will venture to say with confidence that there is not a sentiment to be found elevated or amplified beyond what he really felt ; nor, I would add, even an epithet that goes beyond his actual and true thought. What he was in life and character, that he was, transparently, in every line he wrote—entirely, always, reverentially true."

¹ Dr. Moberly, Head Master of Winchester, Bishop of Salisbury.

CHAPTER V

CHURCH AND STATE

THE effect of 1845 was much as when, in war, the rumour of defeat runs through an army: all eyes are turned on those who have the direction of affairs; it lies with them often by mere demeanour to check defeat, or turn it into a disaster.

Dean Church has left an account, characteristically graphic, of the atmosphere of Oxford in those dark days, that followed the announcement that Newman's mind had been made up. "We sat calmly at our breakfasts every morning, and then some one came in with news of something disagreeable—some one gone, some one sure to go—the good Heads ate and drank, and only cared in an obscure sort of way for these things. We read, we worked at articles for the *Christian Remembrancer* and *Guardian*—*et voilà tout*—the only two 'facts' of the time were that Pusey and Keble did not move, and that James Mozley showed that there was one strong mind and soul still left in Oxford."

For, broken-hearted as Keble may have been, taking the blame for what had passed upon himself, the separation from his fellow-worker led to no faltering about the work itself.

Some time before, Pusey had written to him referring to a possible dedication of "your little book of poetry" (*Lyra Innocentium*) "to the children of our Church, who are indeed so very full of hopefulness to us." And the preface which he wrote for it in February, 1846, revealed the steadfast confidence with which, through all the sadness and the inward self-reproach, he could look forward to the future.

Those to whom the stanzas are familiar will forgive their appearance here.

"What if there were, who laid one hand
Upon the Lyre of Innocence,
While the other over sea and land
Beckon'd foul shapes, in dream intense
Of earthly Passion? Whoso reads,
In pity kneel for him, and pour
A deep heart prayer (O ! much it needs)
That lies may be his hope no more.

"Pray that the mist, by sin and shame
Left on his soul, may fleet ; that he
A true and timely word may frame
For weary hearts, that ask to see
Their way in our dim twilight hour ;—
His lips so purg'd with penance-fire,
That he may guide them, in CHRIST's power,
Along the path of their desire ;

“And with no faint nor erring voice
May to the wanderer whisper, ‘Stay :
God chooses for thee : seal His choice,
Nor from thy Mother’s shadow stray :
For sure thine holy Mother’s shade
Rests yet upon thine ancient home :
No voice from Heaven hath clearly said,
“Let us depart” ; then fear to roam.

““Pray that the Prayer of Innocents
On Earth, of Saints in Heaven above,
Guard, as of old, our lonely tents ;
Till, as one faith is ours, in Love
We own all Churches, and are own’d.
Pray Him to save, by chastenings keen,
The harps that hail His Bride enthron’d
From wayward touch of hands unclean.’”

Indeed, there were in many quarters signs that were encouraging. The consecration of St. Saviour’s Church at Leeds,—the anonymous offering of Pusey,—which almost coincided with the date of Newman’s step, was the foundation of high hopes. It was observed by a week of special devotion, emphasized by a course of special sermons, contributed by Pusey’s friends. Keble was unable to be present, but he sent some sermons which were read for him by Pusey.

A further sign of deepening devotion might be observed, extending over a wider field. This was the gradual but sure development of Sisterhoods, for those who wished to devote themselves in the Religious life to God, and to the exclusive work of the Church—an effort

that was very dear to Pusey's heart, and in which Keble was always ready with advice.

Another practical suggestion concerned the foundation of an economical College in Oxford. In this scheme Marriott, who was gradually taking Newman's place within the inner circle, was warmly interested, and Keble also favoured it, though conscious of the difficulties that it involved. But for the present nothing definite was done.

In January, 1846, *The Guardian* came into being, with the idea of filling the place of the defunct *British Critic*. From Pusey came a plan to set his friends to work upon a Commentary on the Bible. "The very thought of such a plan," he felt, "would tend to give some people courage which they want." It might also have some value as a barrier to the flowing tide of rationalism. Keble he hoped to have persuaded to be editor, or, when this failed, to undertake the Gospel of St. John. But those, to whom he mainly had to look for help, felt unable, whether from stress of work or other claims, to pledge themselves; and the project eventually took shape in a Commentary by Pusey alone on the Minor Prophets.

A more decided gain, perhaps, lay in the fact that the two years' silence that had been imposed on Pusey by the Six Doctors, in 1843, was now ended. He consulted Keble as to the wisest course for him to adopt, when his next

turn to preach before the University should come. Keble in turn consulted his brother, and eventually advised that Pusey should preach, as he proposed, on Absolution, although he might have a simple sermon by him, in case nearer the time the other should seem inexpedient.

The original intention was, however, carried out, and Pusey preached in February, 1846, before a crowded cathedral, upon "Entire Absolution of the Penitent." In it he briefly reasserted what had been condemned in 1843, and continued with the fullest exposition of the doctrine of the Keys. This time a tacit toleration was accorded to the sermon, which Pusey hoped "had helped to quiet minds," that were uneasy.

As a set-back, in 1846, there came an echo reminiscent of earlier troubles, in the nomination by the Prussian Government of a former Lutheran pastor to the vacant Jerusalem Bishopric. Keble, however, saw no need for undue agitation. "I have made up my mind," he writes to his sister, "that this matter, let the worst come to the worst, only proves a want of discipline here, and *that* we knew before."

But all the time there was a steady under-current of anxiety. W. J. Copeland was, throughout the summer of 1847, in great distress about the Articles. Pusey wrote urging him to consult Keble. "I do wish

you would put all your difficulties about the Articles in detail, and show them to J. K. . . . There must be some way of signing the Articles rightly, since J. K., who has so much more of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT, and so much more insight and tenderness, has no difficulty. . . . I know I am not worthy to counsel you about anything, except to go to the father of this Movement, and of each, J. K., and to do what he advises." Many were sent in similar way to Hursley for encouragement. Keble himself, so Pusey told him, was in 1847 reported to be doubting. "I scarcely think," Keble wrote back, "it can do much harm; it is so utterly without ground or foundation; however, I have authorized two persons to contradict it as publicly as they please." Very soon he had ample opportunity of showing that he was still prepared to go on fighting in the cause, of which some others had despaired.

The struggle was now to be transferred to a wider stage than Oxford. The points at issue too were those that, since the very inception of the Movement, had, for many reasons, fallen into abeyance.

The perennial problem of the State in its relations with the Church was still unsettled. The suppression of the Irish Bishopricks had opened many eyes to the transformation that was taking place in those relations; but it was only one expression of a more far-reaching

danger, that was threatened by this changed relationship, and of which the precise form would be determined by the accidents of time. The call to arms in 1833 had stayed, but not removed it.

Its recrudescence was connected with the well-known name of Dr. Hampden, by his appointment to the Bishopric of Hereford in November, 1847. He was still under formal decree of censure of the University, and the outcry that had greeted his selection as Regius Professor was repeated on a larger scale.

Once more the Prime Minister was inundated by petitions, including one from thirteen members of the Episcopate, which was warmly supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury in a private letter to Lord John Russell. But, for the practical result achieved, their energy was wasted. The implied insult to the Church touched Keble very closely. "J. K. is very earnest," Pusey tells a friend. At the same time he heard on good authority that *Arnold's Life and Letters* was the influence at work on Lord John Russell's mind, producing such appointments. "This makes it more than ever a matter of life and death." The matter seemed so grave that Keble was in favour of more drastic measures. He was the instigator of the opposition to the confirmation in Bow Church, and guaranteed a fair proportion of the expenses incurred. Application was made to the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce) for

Letters of Request, enabling action to be taken against Hampden for unorthodoxy, with the idea that, if a suit was pending, the proceedings at Bow Church would stand a better chance.

With the same intention, Keble gave much time, along with Pusey, to drawing up a paper criticizing Hampden's Bampton Lectures ; but, after the recalcitrant minority in Hereford Chapter had been overruled, and the election had been made, the ceremony at Bow Church became a farce ; the objections not being even entertained.

The attempt to compel the hearing of objections by *Mandamus* was equally unproductive, and in the spring of 1848 Hampden's consecration, in which it is said the Bishops of London and Winchester declined to act, was duly solemnized.

That Hampden should be made a Bishop of the English Church was naturally disturbing, and more especially to those, who had not seriously faced the possibilities of unfettered State appointment. Keble some time before, in 1840, on the occasion of Thirlwall's appointment as Bishop of St. Davids, had consulted Pusey as to the formation of a small committee in London to "watch nominations to Bishoprics, collect information, and give alarm in time"; and he was therefore more or less prepared, when all the efforts to avert the scandal failed. His fear was that some, surprised and shocked by the actual working of the system, might magnify

its real significance. He deprecated attaching undue importance to this single portion of the wider controversy. "If persons have thought it their duty," he wrote to Moberly, "to bear with the Puritans and Latitudinarians of times past, so far as not to give up the Church of England to them, nor to acquiesce in their interpretation of its formularies, what is there in this case to make them take a different view?" Although "the day of Hampden's consecration will be a bitter and humiliating day," his views need commit no one but himself and those who have supported him in them. While the Church's formularies remained unchanged, toleration of heresy, even in Bishops, could not be more than injurious to *discipline*. Then, as to Erastianism, "the more I think it over, the more I seem to see that we are on better ground than we have been at least since the Revolution; . . . the one thing to ruin us would be impatience."

A kindred case was that of Dr. Hinds, appointed Bishop of Norwich in 1849; and Keble felt it was incumbent upon Churchmen to undo, if possible, their former failure. He and his friends this time confined themselves to private dealings with the Bishop, eliciting a frank repudiation of the heresies, which certain passages in his writings had been thought to sanction. Again Keble was ready to give the counsels of trust and moderation. "I suppose the right way is to bow one's self down as

under a heavy judgment, without in the least abating one's confidence in our Mother as she shows herself to us." The conclusion is very typical: "In short, wander which way they will, one's thoughts seem always to come back to the Church of Ken and Andrewes as to one's proper ark—if only one have not forfeited one's place in it."

These nominations of the Government, even when, as in the case of Dr. Hinds, the objection was so far successful, drew critical attention to the existing method of episcopal selection, which could make such protests necessary. There was no need, however, to exaggerate what was but accidental, due to the transformation that had gradually been coming over all temporal governments. From being the patrons and protectors of the Church, they had become tyrannical and arbitrary towards it; a change of attitude, which Keble would have thought—grave as it might be for both—more fraught with danger for the State than for the Church.

Meanwhile another and more ominous storm-cloud had arisen.

In 1848, the Bishop of Exeter (Phillpotts) declined to institute the Rev. G. C. Gorham to the living of Brampford Speke, to which he had been presented, on the ground of unsound doctrine about Baptism. It is not necessary to enter on a detailed examination of his views. By holding that the grace of spiritual regenera-

tion in the case of infants was not conveyed in Baptism, without a "prevenient act of grace to make them worthy," he certainly impugned an Article of the Church's faith distinctly stated ; for the effect was to convert the Sacrament, by means of which the Church believed that regenerating grace, with all that followed, was directly given, into the seal of something that had been already done. The case was brought before the Arches Court of Canterbury, which, in August, 1849, upheld the Bishop. On this, Gorham appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Committee heard the case in December, 1849, and Judgment was pronounced in March, 1850. After proclaiming that they had no desire to claim a jurisdiction over matters touching faith and doctrine, and that their function merely was to "consider that which is by law established to be the doctrine of the Church of England, upon the true and legal construction of her Articles and Formularies," the members decided that Mr. Gorham's opinions "are not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England by law established."

This decision, it was seen at once, would raise a double issue. On the one hand, it directly touched a vital doctrine of the Church, however zealously its authors might disclaim any such intention ; on the other, it drew attention, for the first time by practical example, to the constitution of the Court itself.

Everything hung upon the latter point ; and, if the Court's true history and character had been perceived, many heartburnings might have been avoided. With fuller knowledge, the importance of pronouncements emanating from it might have been discounted. But the situation was startling, from the suddenness with which it was developed ; and it is not unnatural that at first the Court was taken at its own value.

In any case it was essential for the Church to remove the slur upon its doctrine. After the failure of the attempt to get the whole proceedings quashed on technical grounds, further steps were necessary. There were petitions to the Crown and to the Bishops, public protests, appeals to the Bishops to make a formal declaration which might alleviate the strain ; or, when there seemed but little chance of this, another plan was to appeal to the Scottish and Colonial Episcopate. The twofold purpose of all these various suggestions was the same—to restore the Church's power of speech in Convocation, so that it might reassert its faith, and to find a remedy for the injustice entailed in the hearing of spiritual causes by non-spiritual courts.

In one of the most weighty of the protests Keble's name appears, and he was among the speakers at the large public meeting in London on July 23, 1850. He was also in close,

though indirect, communication with the Bishop of Exeter, through the medium of Dr. Pusey. The latter, when appealed to by the Bishop for advice, consulted Keble; and it was from Hursley that the suggestion came that led the Bishop to call together his Diocesan Synod.

Across the line of reassertion lay the usual mass of ignorance and opposition. *The Times* described the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, as set forth at the London meetings, to be "a mass of indigestible rubbish which none but a theological ostrich could swallow." Pusey was of opinion that few people really grasped the import of Gorham's statement; the number of those who actually agreed with it was probably extremely limited; the minds of others were confused about "Regeneration." Insistence on the efficacy of the grace imparted in Baptism was misconstrued into something very different—the idea that Regeneration was synonymous with permanent conversion, even final salvation. In truth, as Keble taught, the two were mutually connected by "the absolute necessity of continued or renewed conversion of the selfish will towards God, in all who live to have a conscious will, since without such change of heart and life the Regenerating Grace of Baptism will only serve to our greater condemnation."

There was confusion too upon the other aspect of the question. For the first time the State had overstepped the limits, which on this

side had been supposed to determine its functions ; making it essential not only to reassert the doctrine impugned, but also to define the nature and scope of the Court itself. In its present shape it was not then twenty years old. Its history and functions were but imperfectly appreciated. In any case it was important for the Church to realize exactly what was involved in the connexion with the State, in order that it might correctly judge of what could be accepted, and what, in obedience to principle, must be refused.

To the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as constituted in 1833-4, had been transferred the functions of the old Court of Delegates. Among the functions of the Court of Delegates was the duty of deciding cases of appeal from the ecclesiastical courts, which at that time possessed exclusive cognizance of matrimonial and testamentary causes. Throughout the history of the earlier court, during a period of three hundred years, there had been scarcely any cases, which could by any construction have been brought within the category of doctrine, and of these none had been carried to a definite conclusion. The inference would therefore be that cases of doctrine either were not brought before its notice, or that, if they were, they were held to be outside its province. The latter supposition is confirmed by the general spirit of the Reformation settlement. The object of the Reformation on this side was

to check a grievance of old standing—the assertion of a jurisdiction on the part of the Holy See affecting temporal interests within the English Kingdom, and therefore of appeals to the Roman *Curia*—and with this purpose the Royal Supremacy, “the ancient jurisdiction of the temporal Sovereign,” was laid down in terms. But there was no intention of creating such a situation as that resulting from the position, in which the Act of 1833 had placed the Privy Council by what was generally acknowledged as a legislative oversight. Nor was it possible in practice to substantiate the theory on which the Privy Council claimed to act, i.e. that its decisions were no more than mere interpretations of a pre-existent law. For the interpretation of the law, which has authority’s official seal, is little different from the law itself, and, *Cujus interpretatio ejus lex*, is a maxim of which that side of English law, that modern writers classify as “judge-made,” furnishes a practical example.¹

The confusion partly sprang from the ambiguous use of language. Jurisdiction in the sense of coercive authority—authority, that is, to enforce Church law by external means—is one thing; jurisdiction in the sense of authority to declare Church law, with the consequent right of enforcing it by purely spiritual censures, is another. The one ultimately depends on the temporal power,

¹ Cf. Dicey’s *Law and Public Opinion*, Lecture xi.

the other as clearly has its sanction in the spiritual sphere.¹

Keble, as has been said, was one of those who signed the London protest, immediately after the opinion of the Privy Council was made public. It emphasized the definite teaching of the Creed upon the point of doctrine, and showed with what far-reaching results apparent acquiescence in the Judgment of the Privy Council by the Anglican Communion would be attended. The English Church would be forfeiting the office and authority which it possessed, as member of the Universal Church. Furthermore, the Faith was not a mere collection of isolated tenets, but an indivisible whole. Tampering with a portion would inevitably tend to the loosening, possibly the ultimate destruction, of the entire structure. Keble's perception of the dangers of inaction led him at times to contemplate a "possible suspension of Communion till the matter was Synodically settled." Again, it might be wise and right to institute a prosecution against Mr. Gorham; and it was Keble who advised the Bishop to adopt the course of summoning the Diocesan Synod. In his own church he regularly invited the special prayers of his parishioners "for the whole Church of England in her present distress"; and, among the numerous petitions

¹ It should be noted in this connexion that excommunication involved temporal consequences.

organized throughout the country, there was one from two hundred and five communicants of Hursley to their Bishop, praying him to take action "for removing any doubt which may have arisen on this point," namely, "Whether or no the Church holds it needful to be believed, that by the Blood and Merits of our Saviour CHRIST, Original Sin is remitted to all Infants in Holy Baptism?" For this petition the names, as Keble's covering letter stated, were not put down "for form's sake, nor to please their betters, but with intelligence and hearty good will."

The general line of action must be one of protest: "I am sure (please God)," Keble wrote to the Bishop in the same letter accompanying his parishioners' petition, "the Church of England will never deny the Faith; nor can it ever become a man's duty to leave that Church. But, my Lord, in saying this, I mean the Old Church of England, such as I was baptized and bred in—not such as the established body will become, if it really, by speech or silence, accept the doctrine set forth in this judgment. In such case the Church of England will be to me the protesting minority, not the society recognized, if any be still recognized, by the State."

A letter to Pusey in the spring of 1850 gives a similar illustration of the channel in which Keble's mind was moving: "It seems so far clear that we must all in our places

protest . . . I cannot think that the Non-Jurors' position was so very bad or useless a one. I seem to trace our present life in good measure to it."

Serious, however, as the situation was upon the side of doctrine, it might be possible, by a reassertion of the rights and liberties of Convocation, to save the Church from implication in so vicious a decision. The *fons et origo mali* lay elsewhere, in the anomalous position into which the relations of the Church and State had drifted, and of which the position of the Privy Council was an illustration.

In February, immediately before the Judgment, the Bishop of London (Blomfield) had made suggestions in Parliament for a revision of the Court of Appeal. Their greatest merit lay in their repudiation of the existing Court. This the Bishop's suggestions would have replaced by a heterogeneous substitute, composed of various ecclesiastical dignitaries, but void of any real ecclesiastical authority. Keble thought it might, perhaps, under certain conditions, be better than nothing, as long as future freedom were reserved to those accepting it. "As to the Bishop of London's new Court," he wrote to Pusey, February 19, 1850, "I don't think we ought to be satisfied with it, or with any other which has not the sanction of Convocation—nor with Convocation itself, unless we had a better way of appointing Bishops. Whatever we assent to we must take as the Radicals

do, or as the Church party in France—avowedly as a mere instalment.” But these proposals came to nothing.

In his Assize Sermon of 1833 he had pointed to the changed relationship of Church and State, and subsequent events had fully realized his forecast of increasing difficulties between them. The Hampden and Gorham troubles were practical examples of the danger and futility of trying to perpetuate an ancient theory under entirely changed conditions. As long as the State was definitely Christian, there was some justification for the political theory of “Establishment.” But when once the State admitted its inability to pay religious allegiance to any one specific form of faith, and decided to be, in modern language, undenominational, the foundation, on which the relations of Church and State had hitherto been supposed to rest, was undermined. In name the theory might survive ; but it could never stand the strain of practice.

The two short pamphlets that Keble published in 1850, under the title of “Church Matters in 1850,” are evidence to what degree he was alive to the anomaly, and how he calculated possible results.

The first bore the name of “Trial of Doctrine,” and appeared while judgment was still pending. In clear, straightforward argument it states the Church’s grievance. A cardinal point of its doctrine was being decided by an alien

Court, that was entirely lacking in ecclesiastical authority. Such injustice would be recognized and remedied at once, if it was any other religious body that was concerned. That the Church should be compelled to suffer it must surely be the result of ignorance and misunderstanding. Keble accordingly set to work to deal with some of the causes of confusion.

There was a vague impression in the minds of many people that, by accepting the Royal Supremacy in the sixteenth century, the Church had handed itself over absolutely to the State, and therefore could only blame itself for what had followed. But the acceptance of the Supremacy was never, either by Henry VIII or Elizabeth on the one side, or by the Church on the other, taken to imply the right of the temporal power to interfere with doctrine.

Again, it was sometimes claimed that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was substantially the same Court as the Court of Delegates, which was accepted by the Church. But this, apart from the nature of the questions adjudicated upon by the Court of Delegates, was manifestly not the case. Not only was the Court of Delegates necessarily composed of Churchmen, which was no longer the case with the Judicial Committee, but the whole machinery, in which the earlier Court was set, had undergone a fundamental transformation. The conception of a thorough unanimity and sympathy between the two branches of the

national life, the spiritual and the secular, was irretrievably submerged.

The silencing of the Church's power of speech in Convocation, the disuse of ecclesiastical discipline, the practical extent to which Parliament had become the depository of the Royal Supremacy—above all, the composition of the House of Commons since the repeal of Tests, making it impossible for Parliament any longer to be termed "the lay Synod of the Church"—all these were stages in the disappearance of the earlier order. "And therefore," Keble concludes, "if the sentence of the Privy Council be now, or at any time, such as to favour heresy, let our protest be, once for all, uttered, and let all Christendom ring with it, that this Court is not, cannot be, the Church; that we will not, cannot, be bound by it."¹

This pamphlet was followed in July, 1850, after the blow had actually fallen, by "A Call to speak out."

The Church, Keble thought, though in danger of being morally committed, was as yet not formally committed to the heresy, by communion with Archbishops who appeared to favour it. But it was doubtful if the situation could be any longer met by simple reaffirmation of the single point of doctrine that was involved. Rather it seemed to point to the necessity of a more general survey of "the present relations

¹ "Trial of Doctrine," *Occasional Papers and Reviews*, p. 218.

of the Church to the State in England, and see whether it be possible for us to acquiesce in them any longer without very grievous sin."

This leads him to the indication of the general lines on which the agitation should proceed.

They will best be given as he wrote them :
" We are the one religious body in the Queen's dominions to which the following privileges are expressly denied—to declare our own doctrines ; to confirm, vary, and repeal our own canons ; to have a voice in the nomination of our own chief pastors ; to grant or withhold our own Sacraments, according to our own proper rule as a religious body. Our case is, in short—

" 1. That we are denied these four privileges, which all other religionists have.

" 2. That there is no sufficient reason in the fact of our Church being 'Established' (whatever the word 'Establishment' means) to justify such denial ; but

" 3. That if it should appear on further consideration that 'Establishment' is, in our case, incompatible with true liberties, we earnestly implore that measures may be speedily taken for relieving us of such painful support, and that for this obvious reason—that we had rather be a Church in earnest, separate from the State, than a counterfeit Church in professed union with the State."¹

¹ " A Call to speak out," *Occasional Papers and Reviews*, p. 225.

In June, 1851, a few days before the meeting of the Synod of Exeter, Keble addressed a pastoral letter to his parishioners, telling them in simple language of these troubles that beset the Church, and asking their prayers especially for God's guidance on the Synod's work.

The actual meeting of the Synod was a great encouragement, and an article, that Keble contributed upon it to *The Christian Remembrancer* of 1851, shows him writing in much better heart. The Synod's practical value on all sides was immense, showing that such a thing was possible, and as expressing the living voice of the Church. By believers it was received with special gratitude for the step it took in re-affirmation of the doctrine, and the unanimity with which this was achieved. The worth of this appeal, beyond and against the Privy Council, to the Church could hardly be exaggerated, and, if maintained, the final outcome would be sure; but for the time great patience was required. "‘*Under appeal and doing penance*,’ that is the English Church's place in the kingdom of heaven; we are not saying it of her as in comparison with other Churches, but positively—whatever other Churches are—such, we firmly believe, is our place."

Hampden's appointment had encouraged the formation of Church Unions throughout the country. Another possible result it had, along with Gorham's case, was to supply the force that was, in 1852, to be the means of bring-

ing Convocation back to life. As Keble put it, "that the Hampden and Gorham outrage should lead to the attempted revival of Church Synods was as inevitable as that winter should bring warm clothing into use."

But there were other results less happy. At the public meeting Keble had impressed upon his hearers the need of unflinching faith and patience. "Look at the early Church after Nicaea, A.D. 325," he had said: "how long was it before she had rest from the troubles which then beset her on a chief point of doctrine? . . . The whole air of England seems to me to ring with voices from the dead and from the living, especially from the holy dead, all to this effect: 'Stay here; think not of departing, but here do your work.'"

A similar reliance on the future was beyond the reach of some who were oppressed by present troubles, and who had begun to look elsewhere for comfort. Robert Wilberforce was one of those, and once again the duty of remonstrance and affectionate advice was Keble's. "It almost breaks my heart to think of such a thing," Keble told Pusey, as his mind went back no doubt to memories and hopes of long ago at Southrop. To Wilberforce himself he made the same appeals that he had made ten years before to Newman. Were the grievances, which loomed so large, *inherent* in the English branch of the Church Catholic, or were they but the legacy of past

neglect—a matter calling for repentance, not despair? Was it not possible that his uncertainty in part arose from feelings insufficiently controlled or analysed? In Keble's opinion, Wilberforce was erring on the side of being "too anxious for general and abstract principles . . . instead of clinging to Scripture and primitive antiquity." It was not right to treat the Judgment as affecting the *esse* of the Church, great as the injury might be that it could do to her *bene esse*. On the contrary, the ignorance and lack of opportunity to study antiquity, which were in part responsible for what had happened, demanded very gentle treatment.

Then comes a thought, most characteristic, upon the varying degrees of clearness with which different propositions of the Faith had been laid down. The doctrine of Holy Baptism differed from the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in this—that it had never come before universal Christendom in the shape of a distinct Synodical decision, so that there is much larger room for "material" as distinguished from "formal" heresy on this subject.

The following is evidently an answer to a more deep-seated difficulty. "When we defer to the two Provinces it is not surely that we set them up against the whole Church, but that we accept their voice as repeating to us the message of the whole Church."

"The Church of England," as he elsewhere

expressed it, "is the phase or aspect in which the undivided Church is shown to us": a position qualified, as we have seen above, by the statement that "we ought not to be satisfied with Convocation itself unless we had a better way of appointing Bishops."

If Keble failed, no other human instrument could have succeeded. Robert Wilberforce has said that it was only Keble's influence that held him in his place so long; his own peculiar cast of thought, and the example, in 1851, of his friend Manning, were all the time against success. He waited, however, some three years after Manning, finally making his submission to the See of Rome in 1854.

The Gorham Judgment did for them what had been done for Newman by the popular outcry and the Bishops' charges consequent upon Tract 90.

The various attempts in Parliament to modify the Church's marriage laws, which bore their fruit in the Act of 1857, furnished another instance of the impossibility of working on a theory that was extinct. The State must make its choice between the two alternatives. It is at perfect liberty to say that, representing as it does a medley of religious opinions which its members claim the right to hold, or disregard, at will, it is no longer possible for it to view marriage as other than a civil contract. It can then attach conditions, rigorous or lax, as it thinks fit. This is no more in logic than it said when it

repealed the Test Act ; but if it wishes, with the Church, still to regard marriage as a sacramental bond, it must respect the laws which govern it, deriving their authority from a source admittedly outside State domain. Modern thought has grown accustomed to the adoption of the first of these two courses, viz. the action of the State on purely civil lines. But it is slow to recognize that this decision must at once, in justice, bar the State from interference in the other sphere. On this point Keble was sufficiently emphatic. In a pamphlet which he wrote in 1849, against the change of the law relating to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, he states the arguments by now familiar, and sums them up thus strongly : " I hope we shall in good time speak out, and tell our statesmen and lawyers that no Act of Parliament, nor provincial Canon, nor anything short of a true Œcumenical Council, can possibly set us free from the obligation we feel to regard the marriage of a man with his wife's sister, and all others like unto it, as prohibited by Scripture under the penalties of incest. So that for no religious purpose—Communion, burial, or the like—can we ever recognize such a connexion as a marriage." And, in 1857, when controverting the divorce proposals, he wrote two pamphlets setting forth the indissolubility of Christian marriage. Not only was he jealous of a violation of the Church's law, but he dreaded almost more the practical effect

of such a law upon the general standard of morality. In the first of these two papers he dealt at length with the professed sanction for the relaxation, drawn from passages in the Old Testament and in St. Matthew's Gospel. St. Matthew was especially writing for the Jews; and Keble claims that the concessions could only be rightly interpreted as bearing on the time, in which the old Mosaic law was gradually being grafted into, and finding its fulfilment in, the newer dispensation. The sequel to the earlier argument was of a more substantial nature. It is devoted largely to an examination of the opinion prevalent in the ancient undivided Church. Dealing with the few exceptions, and with the peculiar circumstances by which they had been favoured, he argues, from the testimony of early writers throughout the Christian world, that the discipline of the Church was uniform upon the matter. Such concessions as might have been allowed in former days, "for hardness of heart," in no way operated against the binding power of the underlying law.

That indissolubility of marriage had been the unquestioned law of the Church in England was equally beyond dispute, although foreign influences under Edward VI had for a time encouraged laxity in practice. Glancing at the practice that had grown up from the end of the seventeenth century, of passing Acts of Indemnity to cover breaches of the law, he

says, "But granting that the law of the State is or may be changed partially by these Acts of Indemnity, generally (as we have now cause to apprehend) by the passing of such a law as is now before Parliament, what is that to the spiritual law of the Church? . . . But as no Act of Parliament can absolve us, so neither (we may humbly trust) will any decree of our Mother Church ever pass to excuse us from obedience to so great and sacred a law."

A special interest will always be attached to the marriage hymn, "The Voice that breathed o'er Eden," from the fact that Keble wrote it while deeply engaged in the controversy; but, in spite of all that he could do by the influence of his writings, the change was made in 1857.

It was Mr. Gladstone's stand on behalf of the existing Marriage-laws, in and outside Parliament, that assisted him to his high place in Keble's estimation. This he always retained, in spite of thinking differently from Keble upon the desirability of University reform. The latter was wont to call three witnesses to prove the value of Mr. Gladstone's work for the Church—(1) Divorce, (2) Convocation ("For I suppose their freedom is owing to him"), (3) the non-extension of the Judicial Committee. "I am very wishful for W.E.G.," he writes in June, 1847, to his brother, on an approaching election, "and shall think it a regular blessing to the University if he is elected. He is Pusey in a blue coat; and

what can be said more for any layman? . . . I am so sure of him, that I do not at all mind here and there a speech or a vote which I can't explain." In Gladstone's various contests for the University Keble gave him his support. In 1852, he wrote an open letter giving some reasons for the gratitude that Churchmen ought to feel towards Gladstone, and also vindicating him from the charge of inconsistency in his concurrence with the proposed admission of Jews to Parliament. Their exclusion only served to blind the eyes of those well-meaning persons, who shrank from the recognition of a previously-accomplished fact. The evil, which was undoubted, would be better combated by being admitted. The State had parted with its definite religious character already, and it was dangerous to blink the truth. "Liberties which a Legislature calling itself Christian would be allowed to take with holy things, will be denied to one which acknowledges our LORD but in part."

All will agree upon the ideal importance of a State being Christian : the difference was about the method of attainment.

It has been seen above how Keble judged, in 1834, of any attempt to alter the essentially religious constitution of the University. He looked with abhorrence on the Act of 1854, opening her doors to men of all religions ; and while that measure was in contemplation Keble put out "a few very plain thoughts on the

proposed admission of Dissenters to the University of Oxford." He pleaded that the change would do away with the traditional character which was Oxford's strength. With regard to Founders' wishes, he was diffident of saying much : "It seems to have become so very distasteful a topic." It might be possible, by way of compromise, to extend the system of private affiliated Halls. But he insisted that "no man of candour or common sense can doubt that William of Wykeham and Archbishop Chicheley would rather have their alumni Churchmen after the fashion of the Prayer Book, than a mixed multitude of any or no religion, without common prayers, or definite instruction."

For the same reason he was much concerned with all the troubles about Jowett in the early 'sixties, the origin of which was a proposed increase of endowment for the Regius Professorship of Greek. There was no question that the endowment was inadequate, or that the then occupant of the Chair discharged his professorial duties with ability ; but the University professed by statute to require religious orthodoxy from her Professors, and Jowett's theology in this respect was not above suspicion. The dispute was tortuous and prolonged, and it is needless to revive it. The interest consists, as far as Keble was concerned, in the illustration that it gave of his general point of view. For a suggested prosecution

of Jowett he contributed £100, and justified it in a letter to *The Guardian*, for the reason that the question under discussion was no less important than this—"Whether the University of Oxford now is, and means to be hereafter, a believer in the Bible or no."

To some these sentiments may seem intolerant, but, if they are to be appraised correctly, due allowance must be made for their environment. In no case is it easy to be accurate in forming retrospective judgments: what one generation must resist, the next may not infrequently accept, from never having had the alternative submitted to it. But the alternative in 1854 was very present. The force of Oxford's ecclesiastical connexion may be gauged by the importance that all sides attached to the pronouncements of her governors upon Church matters—to their utterance, for example, upon Tract 90, or, again, to their condemnation of Pusey's sermon—a point of view to-day incomprehensible.

Indifference, too, is sometimes represented under the specious guise of toleration, and those who hold paramount the need of definite, right belief, expose themselves to the charge of bigotry.

The true course often lies between the two: each principle may have a share in its discovery. As Archbishop Tait once pithily expressed it, the difficulty arises when "the Liberals are deficient in religion, and the religious are deficient in liberality."

CHAPTER VI

GUIDE, PHILOSOPHER, AND FRIEND

ONE of the few occasions, on which Keble found himself in temporary disagreement with Pusey, was connected with the Gorham troubles. To all who grasped their true import they were necessarily a source of great disquiet. For some, as we have seen, they were to be the signal of departure. And there were those who, while disposed to share the work of protest, wished to be reassured about the course that others of their fellow-workers would adopt in the event of failure. The public mind, moreover, is seldom quick to apprehend distinctions ; its confidence, it will be owned, had been severely tried. Hence there arose in certain quarters the demand for an anti-Roman declaration.

It was proposed to pass it, in the form of a statement of principle at the meeting of the Bristol Union, of which both Pusey and Keble were members, in October, 1850. Keble, though, as he told Pusey, "a good deal perplexed," was at first inclined to favour something of the kind. "I own that I am

greatly disposed to a *very moderate* but *quite real* disavowal of Rome. I think the quiet and true people whom we want to act with us, have a fair claim to it after what has happened." He was unwilling also that the keener anti-Roman spirits should be wholly thrown upon themselves, with no restraining hand to guide them. Pusey was utterly opposed to it. He had better opportunities at this juncture of knowing the effect that such a declaration might produce. "The issue of this meeting," he writes, "will determine whether the High Church will break into two or more parties. It will be very difficult to keep them together. An anti-Roman declaration will hopelessly split us." Support that he might give was sure to be interpreted as meaning more than he intended, and those who looked to him would be discouraged. He was quite ready for a declaration to avow "the hope and purpose to live and die in the English Communion." But a pure negation was of questionable value. "J. H. N. wrote more daringly and vehemently against Rome than any."

Eventually, to Pusey's great relief, Keble was convinced. "It was such a comfort," writes Pusey, "to hear from you, and to feel that I was not to be alone—*Patre Orbatus*." At the meeting the original motion for the declaration was defeated in favour of an amendment, declining any declaration beyond the existing formularies of the Church of

England. For both, the difference, while it lasted, was a matter of profound concern. Closely associated as they had been before, Newman's departure had drawn them together even more entirely.

At the end of 1846, Pusey had made his first Confession to Keble, thereby establishing the spiritual relationship, that was maintained by periodical visits to Hursley up to the time of Keble's death. The asceticism of Pusey's penitential rules filled Keble with compunction. The consciousness of sin, that they revealed, evoked his genuine humility, making him almost diffident of giving counsel in a field so sacred. Although he sanctioned them, he pleaded as a friend that the discipline might not be applied too rigorously. For his own part, he writes, "I hope that by His great blessing the having your rules by me will be of use; were it only for the feeling of shame which will come over one at the thought of such a thing being in one's desk, while one is all ease and comfort." Outside this special sphere it was an intimacy that touched at every point. Keble had entered into all the hopes and expectations that had centred in St. Saviour's, Leeds, and he shared the disappointments that so quickly followed on its opening. In the misunderstandings that arose, Keble tried to act as intermediary, writing to the Bishop on behalf of the incumbent, and journeying to

Leeds to have an interview with Dr. Hook, the then Vicar of Leeds, out of whose parish St. Saviour's had been formed.

Another matter, in which Keble had collaborated, was the partial cause of an exercise of episcopal authority directly affecting Pusey. This was the translation and preparation for use by English Churchmen, of a certain number of Roman Catholic books of devotion. Pusey had for a long time felt how much there was contained in them, that English Churchmen could appreciate, and use with profit. Keble assisted with advice, and in 1847 had helped with the translation of certain portions. But, while in thorough sympathy with Pusey's work, he deprecated undue haste, in view of the prevailing prejudice which ought to be considered. The execution of this project bore to Bishop Wilberforce the character of "tending to the spread of Romanism amongst us," and with other reasons of a kindred nature, led to his placing Pusey under secret inhibition from ministering publicly within the Diocese of Oxford (November, 1850). The parts of Pusey's teaching that the Bishop mainly feared were those relating to Confession, and to the propitiatory Sacrifice offered in the Holy Eucharist. While ready to believe in Pusey's individual loyalty, he could not but regard his influence with great suspicion.

For the few months after November, affairs were at a standstill, pending the appearance of

a letter to the Bishop of London, on which Pusey was engaged in answer to the charges brought against him. This was finished and sent to the Bishop of Oxford at the end of February, 1851.

Keble now began a series of attempts to place matters on a better footing, by writing more than once himself to Bishop Wilberforce. Being considerably the Bishop's senior, he was in his letters able to combine with solid argument a strain of almost fatherly rebuke. The general tendency of Pusey's teaching, so he asserted, was the exact reverse of what the Bishop feared, as fostering a distinctly Roman tendency ; for Pusey tried to prove to those, who had become conscious of their obligations to the Catholic Church, that the English Church, as a true part of it, had a right to their allegiance. "The temptation arising from Hampden's being made and acknowledged Bishop, would have been more keenly, more extensively felt, had there been no Pusey amongst us." Upon the special points of Confession and the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, he explained that he and Pusey stood on common ground. Moreover, even if it were not one of his dearest friends who was involved, he would still have felt it necessary to testify, for any such public censure as the Bishop had in view would be disastrous both to the Church as a whole, and also to individuals. "I am greatly mistaken," he

writes on June 3, 1851, "if there be any one thing that could be done so likely" (as a censure on the two grounds above-mentioned) "to drive waverers on towards Rome, and to weaken the hands of the most faithful and self-denying among us."

Some time had still to elapse before the episode was closed. The Roman Catholic adapted books presented difficulties, but Keble was opposed to their withdrawal. "You must on no account withdraw those two books," he writes to Pusey on July 29, 1851. "I do not say that you might not perhaps make a few omissions in reprinting the *Paradise*—not as though the passages were unjustifiable, but on the ground of their being misunderstood, and startling good people. If you asked my leave to do it, I should grant it you; but you know, far better than I, what effect such a thing would have in different directions." Ultimately, to some extent through Keble's influence, the Bishop learned to form a truer estimate of Pusey, and in 1852 the informal inhibition was withdrawn.

Twelve years later the difficulties arising out of the case of *Essays and Reviews*, and that of Colenso, Bishop of Natal, brought Pusey and his Bishop into close co-operation. In Keble's case, too, the affection with which he later spoke of the Bishop, showed that the incident had left no relic of unpleasantness in their relations. Meeting Keble on one occasion

in 1862, Moberly inquired the reason why he looked so pleased. The answer was, "The Bishop of Winchester has begun a letter to me, 'Dear Mr. Keble.'"

Towards the end of this same year, 1852, Pusey was thinking of a subject upon which to preach before the University in January. For several reasons, he inclined to treat of the Holy Eucharist in the case of the Impenitent. It would be supplementary to his sermon upon "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent," for which he had been condemned by the Six Doctors in 1843. The doctrine was not yet, he felt, entirely free from the slur that had been cast upon it; but if it were restated, and the authorities refrained from repetition of their previous condemnation, it would amount to an acknowledgement on their part that their former action could not be sustained. As usual, however, he consulted Keble. The latter was cautious and fearful that it might "raise instead of tending to settle a controversy; and that on a point which one would least wish to see bandied about in the papers." Moreover, "it seems so much like inquiring into the *manner* of the Real Presence that I am more than half-afraid of the subject."

Such, indeed, must ever be the longing instinct of all reverent hearts, upon approaching near to the inscrutable mystery of God's Love; but when the mystery is called in question, some attempt at definition is at once inevitable.

So the sermon¹ was preached on January 16, 1853; and without the undesirable results that Keble had anticipated.

But the controversy very soon broke out elsewhere, and Keble was compelled to take a part. This time the full force of the storm was visited upon Archdeacon Denison. It had its origin in two sermons preached by the Archdeacon in August and November, 1853, at Wells Cathedral, upon the Holy Communion. In February, 1854, Mr. Ditcher, the Vicar of a neighbouring parish, made a complaint about them to the Bishop. In May, 1854, Bishop Bagot died, and was succeeded by Lord Auckland, who followed the example of his predecessor in declining to give his sanction to legal proceedings. Mr. Ditcher, however, was persistent, and discovered that the Bishop, being the patron of the Archdeacon's living, could not properly decide upon the case at all. It was therefore brought officially before the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose first step was to appoint a small Commission, to decide the question whether or not there was a *prima facie* case for trial by the Court of Arches. The report, that such a *prima facie* case existed, was made in January, 1855, but the Bishop of the Diocese, Lord Auckland, still refused to send the case to the Court of Arches. The Archbishop, therefore, in July, 1856, constituted a Court under the Church Discipline Act to hear

¹ The Presence of CHRIST in the Holy Eucharist.

it, and in the Judgment given in August, the Archdeacon's teaching was condemned, and a certain time allowed, in which he might revoke his statements.

The points that were thus held contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England were that the Body and Blood of CHRIST are given to, taken and received by, unworthy communicants, and that "Worship is due to the Real, though Invisible and Supernatural, Presence of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Holy Eucharist under the form of Bread and Wine," consequent upon the Act of Consecration.

Keble had written a letter to *The Guardian* in November, 1854, very soon after the commencement of proceedings, in which he said plainly what he thought of them. He was not able yet to go the whole way with Denison or Pusey about the doctrine of reception by the wicked; but Denison's propositions on this subject contained nothing that might not be tolerated, and did not affect the main issue. This was no less than an attack upon the Real Presence; and in face of this, the minor differences that were not fundamental should be set aside. "I, for one, am sorrowfully convinced that if the three propositions above specified" (affirmatory of the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence) "were to be deliberately declared by any competent authority (suppose Convocation) untenable in the Church of England, a far more serious question would arise,

concerning the reality of our Communion with the Universal Church than has ever yet arisen. . . . The question is not whether or no we agree with the Archdeacon in every point, but whether or no we concur with his accusers, in desiring to cast out of the Church all who hold the doctrine of a Real Objective Presence, as inherited by our Church from Antiquity, taught in our Catechism, maintained by our great Divines, and implied, while it is guarded from abuse, in our Articles." And, after the Archbishop's Court had given its decision, Keble was very conscious of the need of some reply from those who could not acquiesce in it, and wrote to Pusey suggesting that a Protest should be set on foot. But he was rather hampered by the temporary disagreement with Pusey upon the subject of reception by the wicked, alluded to above, which was the cause of a prolonged correspondence between them. Gradually Pusey's arguments, and those of Mr. Grueber, the Incumbent of St. James's, Hambridge, convinced him. The result was the Protest that was published on October 21 and 22, 1856, coinciding with the final pronouncement of sentence upon Denison by the Archbishop's Court at Bath. The Protest affirmed (1) "the doctrine of the Real Presence of 'The Body and Blood of our Saviour CHRIST under the form of Bread and Wine.'" (2) "That the interpretation of Scripture most commonly held in the

Church has been that the wicked, although they can "in no wise be partakers of CHRIST," nor "spiritually eat His Flesh and drink His Blood," yet do in the Sacrament not only take, but eat and drink unworthily to their own condemnation, the Body and Blood of CHRIST which they do not discern." (3) That worship was rightly given to CHRIST "then and there especially present, after consecration and before communicating."

Pusey prepared a further paper for publication to explain the course, which those who had signed it would adopt, if the Archbishop's Judgment was confirmed. It had been rumoured that they might secede and form themselves into a Non-Juring Church. This was no part of their design. The object of the Protest had been to unburden conscience, and to explain exactly where they stood. Firmly convinced, as those who had signed it were, that there was nothing in the Articles by which the Judgment could be justified, they could not look on it as binding. "They have brought meaning *into* the Articles, not *out* of them." Retirement would be tantamount to abnegation of responsibility. "We are in a place of sacred trust. If we voluntarily retire from our place, we betray our trust; if we continue in our place, saying nothing, we *seem* to betray it. Either way there is grievous scandal. The only course open to us is publicly to apprise those in authority over us

that we cannot obey them in this, and to go on as before, leaving it to them to interfere with us, or no, as they may think fit. The being of the Church of England we believe to be perfectly unaffected by this decision, grievous as the result of it may be in respect of her wellbeing. The sentence of an Archbishop's Court may make an act penal; but the sentence of one man cannot bind the conscience. Prosecution after prosecution can but deprive individuals. Nothing less than the voice of the Church can make any decision the judgment of the Church; and nothing but the judgment of the Church (in fact, a new 'Article of Religion') can limit, as now proposed, the meaning of the present Articles."

Keble had revised the proofs, and begged for something very downright. "Make that new paper," he had written on November 11, 1856, "such as to commit no one but us two any more than is possible consistently with it committing *us entirely*." There were, however, difficulties attending its immediate publication, which delayed its appearance, till Keble printed it a little later at the end of his treatise upon Eucharistical Adoration.

This was his most substantial contribution to the controversy, and is, within the limits that he postulates, remarkable for range and depth of treatment. Its object is to show how Adoration must inevitably spring from the belief in the doctrine of the Real Presence,

rather than to substantiate the doctrine itself. This had been already done in great detail by Pusey.

"The Essay itself, taking generally the doctrine of the Real Presence for granted, tries to illustrate and enforce from it, and from the Prayer Book which teaches it, the moral and devotional duty of Adoration." This assumption might appear a wide one; but to Keble's thought there was no alternative between definite acceptance of the doctrine and its definite denial. Those who denied the Real Presence taught in effect a Real Absence. From the latter, when it was seen to be the only other course of two, many would instinctively shrink back, and come to realize that they, unconsciously perhaps, had held the former. It was in this connexion, as will be remembered, that Keble sanctioned in after years the well-known alteration in *The Christian Year*. The original version of the stanza was :

"Oh, come to our Communion Feast!
There, present in the heart,
Not in the hands, the eternal Priest
Will His true self impart."¹

Many years before, Pusey and Froude had called attention to the danger of the words "Not in the hands" being taken, in an *exclusive* sense, to countenance a denial of the Real Objective Presence. Keble, however, while

¹ *The Christian Year*, "Gunpowder Treason."

admitting that he had gained a fuller knowledge of Eucharistic doctrine since the composition of the poem, hesitated to make any change. As with the text "I will have mercy, *not* sacrifice," so here he claimed that "*not* in the hands" might fairly be construed "*not only* in the hands." Furthermore, he thought the words, as they stood, were valuable as guarding the interpretation of the mystery from any "notion of a gross carnal Presence" (*Eucharistical Adoration*, second edition, xiii).

In 1866, however, the construction, hostile to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, placed upon the line by Bishop Jeune in Convocation, convinced Keble of the need of some revision. By the substitution of a single word, "As" for "Not," the lines were left, as they have appeared in all subsequent editions—

"There present, in the heart
As in the hands, the eternal Priest
Will His true self impart."

Of the Real Presence the evident corollary was Adoration. "It is as impossible for devout faith, contemplating CHRIST in this Sacrament, not to adore Him, as it is for a loving mother looking earnestly at her child not to love it." This sense was reinforced by all the promptings of natural piety. The greatness of the Gift, the wonderful directness of relationship through which it was bestowed, must equally compel unquestioning devotion

to that which truly was "an extension of the Incarnation." Moreover, Holy Scripture abounded in analogy lending support to similar conclusions. For, as especial honour was associated throughout our LORD's earthly life with all that was the most expressive of His deep humility, so it was fitting that peculiar adoration should be found along with the memorial of Himself, to outward eyes so humble, that He had condescended to establish.

The presence of the Holy Angels at the moment of His Birth, of His Temptation, of the Agony in the Garden, found its counterpart in the instinctive feeling of the Church that they attended, and participated in, its worship in the Holy Eucharist.

Again, "Was JESUS the Name among all His Names the most expressive of His deep humiliation? So are the sacramental elements among all the means of grace, both as being in themselves so cheap and ordinary, and as representing especially His Death and Passion. Was JESUS, our LORD's *Proper* Name, brought from Heaven, with a command that by It above other names we should make mention of Him? So was the Holy Eucharist divinely ordained, that by it above all other rites we should make memorial of Him." So with the figure of the instrument of man's redemption. "The exaltation of the Cross above all other Christian signs . . . would lead us to anticipate some signal honour as likely to be

accounted due to the Holy Eucharist, associated as that Sacrament inseparably is with what took place on the Cross."

The fact that the Incarnation was the channel which God's love selected for the pouring of His benefits and grace upon mankind implied "The worship of our LORD in His human nature made adorable by its union with the Divine." It was therefore at least permissible to think that "such worship would not be forbidden, but rather sanctioned and enjoined, in that Sacrament which, rather than anything else, is the standing monument of the Incarnation and the extension of it."

This portion of the argument Keble reduces to a syllogistic proposition :

- (1) "The Person of JESUS CHRIST our LORD, wherever it is, is to be adored."
- (2) "CHRIST'S Person is in the Holy Eucharist by the presence of His Body and Blood therein."
- (3) "The Person of CHRIST is to be adored in that Sacrament, as there present in a peculiar manner by the presence of His Body and Blood."

The minor premiss was the point of doubt and controversy : and yet denial of it must at least repose upon the basis of Nestorianism—the separation of our LORD'S Humanity from His Divinity. For else the presence of the one would postulate the presence of the other. And the One Person of our LORD so present

would call for adoration. And in this case "It is no more natural to think, one way or the other, of worshipping the Bread and Wine than it was for the woman with the issue of blood to think of worshipping the garment which she touched, instead of Him Who was condescending to wear it, and make it an instrument of blessing to her."

The Holy Eucharist, moreover, was the divinely-ordered means of showing forth on earth the work of man's Redemption, connecting, as it were, the Old Testament sacrifices, which were types of the one Sacrifice upon the Cross, with the perpetual pleading of that Sacrifice in Heaven.

The sacrificial nature of the Holy Eucharist, which from the first the Church had taught, supplied the answer to what Keble called "the only plausible objection" brought against Adoration. This was the absence in the Liturgies of prayers addressed directly to our LORD there present after Consecration. But the objection vanished when it was remembered that the Holy Eucharist was the offering of a Sacrifice *by* the SON, Himself both Priest and Victim, *to* the FATHER. In the same way the Liturgies contained no rubrics enjoining Adoration. But, over and above the tendency to keep the mysteries secret from the proximity of the heathen, the necessity for such directions did not arise, the practice resting on the universally received tradition. "The very Creed for a

long period was not allowed to be put into writing."

Much of the confusion sprang from a mistaken prejudice. Attempts at over-definition of the *manner* of the mystery had led to the repudiation of the doctrine of the mystery itself, that they had been designed to safeguard.

The Judgment in the case of Denison had shown that such common condemnation was at the time no phantom-danger; and therefore Keble follows up his general survey with a more particular examination of the formal teaching of the Church of England, in relation to the doctrine and the practice consequent upon it. And the conclusion is unhesitatingly affirmed: "I must take leave to say that, granting the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, Adoration is not only permitted, but enjoined by the Church of England in her Prayer Book. Those who would prove that she prohibits the one must first make out that she denies the other—which they can never do as long as her Catechism and her Communion Office remain."

Nor did the knowledge that there might have been exaggerations leading to abuse materially affect the situation. "The doctrine, if revealed at all, is revealed for ever: the homage, if due at first, must be due always: it cannot be innocently suspended or done away."

In these circumstances, Keble thought Churchmen could not mistake their duty. His practical advice was a repetition of that contained in Pusey's letter, to which reference has been made above, and which Keble appended to his own treatise. The decision of the Archbishop could in no sense bind the Church or override the truth embodied in its formularies. And, therefore, in the event of further steps being taken in pursuance of the Judgment, it would be "the duty of every Catholic clergyman to abide in his place until he was forcibly expelled from it."

The Judgment of the Court at Bath upon the case of Archdeacon Denison was set aside upon appeal to the Arches Court, on account of a technical flaw in the proceedings. And, when further appeal was lodged by the complainant, Mr. Ditcher, the decision of the Arches Court was upheld by the Judicial Committee in February, 1858.

It is pleasant to remember that, before the close of his life, Mr. Ditcher became deeply attached to Archdeacon Denison, and that it was at the special request of Mrs. Ditcher that Archdeacon Denison preached in South Brent Church on the Sunday morning following Mr. Ditcher's funeral in November, 1875.

But, while the Archdeacon's case was still proceeding, a further trouble of the same kind was already brewing in the Scottish Church.

The Primary Charge of Bishop Forbes of Brechin in August, 1857, was the beginning of a three years' controversy, closely allied to that in which Archdeacon Denison had been involved. The portions of the charge that principally evoked hostility, were those affirming that the Sacrifice offered in the Holy Eucharist was "substantially one" and "in some transcendental sense identical" with that offered on the Cross; that "supreme Adoration is due to the Body and Blood mysteriously present in the Gifts"; and that "in some sense the wicked do receive CHRIST indeed to their condemnation."

Friendship and admiration for the Bishop would at once have prompted Keble to take an active part in the proceedings; but there were other and more general reasons which were of even greater cogency. Although the matter might appear upon the surface to be one in which the Scottish Church alone was implicated, such questions cannot be susceptible of rigid geographical confinement. The forces ranged on either side extend beyond those boundaries, and cause doctrinal battles to assume a more far-reaching influence. Hence Keble saw that from the general standpoint, as well as from its direct effect upon the English Church, the issue raised by the attack on Bishop Forbes was vital. His Honorary Canonry of Cumbrae gave him a certain *locus standi* among the Scottish clergy, and provided him, if such were needed, with

an excuse for intervention. His first attempt was in the form of a long letter to the Bishop of Edinburgh, dealing with a document put out by three of the Scottish Bishops after the Synod in December. The point to which he especially devotes attention, repeating what he had written in his Eucharistical treatise just published, is the impossibility of distinguishing between the presence of CHRIST's Body and the presence of His Person. The two natures of CHRIST, the Human and the Divine, had been inseparably united in one Person by the Incarnation. The attempt to interpret the Eucharistic mystery, in terms exclusive of such union, must lead directly to Nestorianism.

In May, 1858, the Synod met again, and took more formal action. A Pastoral Letter was drawn up and signed by all the six Scottish Bishops, severely censuring the Bishop of Brechin's charge, by reason of its "tendency to undermine the great foundations upon which our formularies rest," and concluding with some practical admonitions to the clergy on the subject.

This episcopal pronouncement was criticized by Keble in his "Considerations suggested by a late Pastoral Letter on the Doctrine of the Most Holy Eucharist." "Respectfully addressed to Scottish Presbyters" by one of their own number, their purpose is to show how far the pastoral can claim the

unquestioning obedience of the clergy. Keble recommended that the Letter should be simply viewed as an expression of opinion by the Bishops, upon certain points of doctrine, for the information of their flocks. Its statements lacked supporting argument: they had been prefaced by no consultation with the body of the Presbyters: due Synodical precedent had been neglected by the total absence of the customary witness of the faithful. "To a document so issued attention and respect must of course be due. Still it leaves room for dissent, silence, or remonstrance, as the case may require, without undutifulness."

With this proviso, Keble opens a fire of searching criticism upon the propositions that the pastoral contained, and shows what those accepting it would be affirming. The positive statements were inadequate, but they said nothing in which everybody might not cheerfully agree. Upon the negative side the Pastoral was very much less satisfactory, impugning as it did the doctrine of a "Real Essential Presence" and the true sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist, "in the relation of the Eucharist on earth to His continual intercession in heaven." Unknown possibly to its framers, the Letter controverted the unquestionable teaching of the early Church, to which they nominally looked; and, as Keble pointed out once more, their argument opened the door to the Nestorian heresy. In great measure the

“Considerations” are a restatement of the argument of “Eucharistical Adoration,” but, from the nature of the case, they are compressed within the compass of a practical appreciation of the situation. They are concluded by two papers, the first of which was from the hand of Pusey, summing up the reasons that must prohibit acquiescence in the Synodical interpretation of the Church’s doctrine ; the other took the shape of a concise collection of dogmatic propositions, which Diocesan Synods might adopt by way of an alternative. For some time subsequent to the appearance of Keble’s essay in 1858, although there were many symptoms of unrest within the Scottish Church, no definite action was initiated against the Bishop of Brechin. But in October, 1859, he was formally presented to the Episcopal Synod on the ground of unsound teaching in his charge of August, 1857. The following January was fixed for the handing in to the Court of the Bishop’s defence. While this was being constructed with the help of Pusey, and to a somewhat less degree of Keble, negotiations were set on foot for the discovery, if possible, of terms of settlement acceptable to either side. Keble was very anxious that the Bishop should make it clear that all that he demanded at the present time was toleration. In November, 1859, he writes : “He (the Bishop) really is unreasonable if he is not content

with toleration, seeing it is the most that the whole truth has been able to get anywhere this thousand years and more. . . . Ought he not, in the outset, to make a great point of not being tried by the English Divines, and to challenge any one to show that they are part of our 'Rule of Faith' any more than as showing what has been tolerated?" A letter that he wrote to Moberly about this time will show, perhaps, the simple hope and faith through which he viewed the necessary stress of controversy. It is interesting too for the personal tribute of affectionate respect. "Might we not, think you, take as our point of reunion that sentence of Bishop Ken?—'I believe Thy Body and Blood to be as really present in the Holy Sacrament as Thy Divine power can make it, though the manner of Thy mysterious Presence I cannot comprehend.' . . . How pleasant it will be (D.V.) to go on in peace and to think that, under God, we are indebted to Bishop Ken for that peace."

But the negotiations for a settlement were unproductive, and the trial took its course. The Synod met in February, 1860, and, after hearing the Bishop's reply to the presentment and the presenter's answer to it, was adjourned till March, pending a further reply from the Bishop, before proceeding to a final judgment. Keble had been to Edinburgh in February for the formal opening of the case, Pusey thinking that his own attendance "would do more harm

than good"; and Keble was also present at the conclusion of the case in March.

The Judgment, which was then delivered, was a censure of the Bishop's statements in regard to the relation between the Eucharistic Sacrifice and that upon the Cross, and condemned the language that the Bishop had employed, about the Adoration due to the Body and Blood of CHRIST mysteriously present in the Gifts. As far as the General Synod was immediately concerned, this was the end of their activity. But their declaration of censure and admonition contained the seed of some unwitting misconceptions, which Bishop Forbes attempted to remove in his charge to the diocese in August, being rewarded by his own Synod with an almost unanimous vote of confidence.

So closed, in 1860 (with the exception of the discussion on the revision of the Scotch Communion Office, which for some time continued to create anxiety), this phase of the Eucharistic controversy. But the cessation of the actual fighting by no means signified that the attacking forces had been more than temporarily withdrawn. Due as it was to practical considerations of expediency, it was at most a grudging acquiescence in what could not be avoided. Keble was dead before those who assailed the Catholic interpretation of the formularies of the Church of England were beaten upon their own ground by the decision of the Privy Council

in its favour in Mr. Bennett's case. But decisions, as Keble often pointed out, when they are contrary to the truth, can of themselves effect but little. Nor can the duty of assertion in the teeth of such contradictions ever be discharged in the sense of being accomplished once for all. As Keble saw, a partial measure of acceptance is all that, speaking humanly, the Truth is ever likely to command. What is essential is that those, who know the Faith, shall look to it that, so far as lies within their power, it takes no hurt.

CHAPTER VII

THE PARISH PRIEST

CARDINAL Manning, shortly before his death, told the story of an incident, which happened at one of the early conferences of those perplexed by the decision of the Court in Gorham's case. The first meeting, at which neither Pusey nor Keble was present, adopted certain propositions, affirming that by the Gorham Judgment the Church of England had forfeited its Divine Commission. At the following meeting Pusey and Keble got this changed, by an amendment to the effect that "if the Church of England shall accept this Judgment, it would forfeit its authority as a Divine Teacher." "This amendment," said Manning, "was accepted because it did not say whether the Church of England had or had not *de facto* accepted the Judgment. Hope said, 'I suppose we are all agreed that if the Church of England does not undo this we must join the Church of Rome.' This made an outcry; and I think it was then that Keble said, 'If the Church of England were to fail it should be found in my parish.'"

The incident, if historical, is striking evidence of the suspicion with which Keble viewed in such matters the conclusions of pure logic, and of his own resolve, at whatever cost, to maintain the Truth. Proceeding not infrequently upon arbitrary assumption, the argument of logic takes little heed of qualifying considerations—in this case the facts of history and human nature—by which the conclusion may be affected.

For another reason, also personal, the anecdote is interesting. Although, as we have seen, he was always prepared to join in any of the wider issues which from time to time were forced upon the Church, Keble was pre-eminently a parish priest. It is curious, for example, to observe how he enforced the more general bearing of Church difficulties by particular application to his own parochial work. In the Gorham case, in the changes of the Marriage law, in all the anxiety engendered by the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, he was especially distressed by the thought of the effect upon the simple-minded faith of those among whom he worked.

As an undergraduate, Isaac Williams had been astounded at the sight of Keble, then the most distinguished man in Oxford, abandoning his University career to bury himself in a small curacy in Gloucestershire. Many since Isaac Williams have felt similar surprise, on learning that by far the greater part of Keble's life was

spent in serving country parishes ; and this surprise is pardonable, in view of the constant tendency to establish an invariable connexion between usefulness and position.

But, with the further inference that is sometimes drawn, the case is different. It is assumed that Keble, sensitive of temper and of a retiring disposition, sought in his country work a refuge from the din of public controversy. It may be very true to say that the quiet surroundings of Hursley were naturally congenial ; and that he drew upon them, as upon a store of strength, preparatory to sterner work outside. To say more than this is totally to misread Keble's character. It must be owned that the supposed attempt to withdraw into himself was singularly unsuccessful : and, in truth, it would be difficult to conceive a supposition more discordant with the actual facts.

Being in the centre of things at Oxford, it was naturally to Pusey that, in the eyes of the world, the task of leadership reverted after 1845. But even Pusey seldom committed himself to a decision of first-class importance without consulting Keble. Recalling the latter's labours, arduous and self-imposed, on behalf of Archdeacon Denison, Bishop Forbes (of Brechin), or Bishop Gray (of Capetown), it may be safely said that no person was identified, or identified himself, more readily or closely, with those whom circumstances chose from time to time to be protagonists in the Church's battles.

Keble was appointed Vicar of Hursley in 1835 by his old Oriel pupil, Sir William Heathcote, and the Vicarage was his home until his death in 1866.

The parish was a scattered one, with a population of between a thousand and fifteen hundred people, situated upon the Hampshire Downs, about six miles south-west of Winchester. Early in the fourteenth century the great tithe of Hursley had been appropriated for the endowment of the College of S. Elizabeth at Winchester. To compensate the Vicar of Hursley for this loss, the Rectory of the neighbouring village of Otterbourne was united with the Vicarage of Hursley; and Otterbourne, along with the village of Ampfield and the outlying hamlet of Pitt, were all included in the parish.

Hursley itself can boast some slight historical associations. A lane lays claim to the title of King's Lane, on the score of having been the route followed by the charcoal-burner's cart, carrying William Rufus's body to Winchester after his death in the New Forest. At the northern edge of Hursley Park may be traced the ruins of the ancient castle of Merton, built by King Stephen's brother, Henry, Bishop of Winchester, during his struggle with the Empress Maud. The village inn, where business is carried on under the sign of the "King's Head," recalls the time when King and Parliament were the rallying cries of

Cavalier and Roundhead. Richard Cromwell too was connected with the place by his marriage with a daughter of Mr. Maijor, then Squire of Hursley ; and to Richard Cromwell Hursley churchyard owes its debt of gratitude for the avenues of lime-trees in which the church is framed.

The influence of the new Vicar soon made itself perceptible in the establishment of daily services, and in more frequent celebrations of the Holy Eucharist. The work of building churches for Otterbourne and Ampfield was set on foot almost at once. Part of the cost was found by the proceeds of *The Christian Year* ; part came from the generosity of friends, Sir William Heathcote making himself responsible for the entire charges of the work at Ampfield. The new churches in these two places, which were ultimately formed into separate parishes, were consecrated respectively in 1839 and 1841, Newman and Isaac Williams being among those to attend the ceremony at Ampfield.

As soon as these were off his mind, Keble began to think seriously of Hursley. The existing church, almost certainly the fourth to stand on the same site, only dated from the eighteenth century ; but it was not satisfactory, and it was eventually decided to rebuild it.

Towards this object, again, Keble drew upon the money accruing from *The Christian Year*, a fund purposely reinforced by the publication of

the *Lyra Innocentium*. As much as possible of the old work was left and utilized ; the tower, built by William of Wykeham, being raised, and the present spire, given by Sir William Heathcote, added to it. Many other sympathizers helped with gifts of money, or of furniture and fittings for the church. Keble took upon himself the lion's share of the expense of the fabric : he also put in the windows, following the arrangement and idea of those in Fairford Church, and gave the kneeling-desks and seats, which were so designed as to make an attitude of devotion almost unavoidable.

While the work was in progress, service was held in a neighbouring barn ; and by the autumn of 1848 the new church was ready to be consecrated.

It was always one of Keble's objects to encourage his people to feel a definite personal interest in the church ; and the annual Dedication Festival, with its tea for the children, and its treat at the " King's Head " for all parishioners over sixty-five, was one of the many ways by which he sought to make the church the centre of the village life. The School Treats in the Park generally began with service in church, and finished with the singing of Ken's evening hymn, " Glory to Thee, my God, this night," upon the Vicarage lawn.

For some time too, in order to provide an occupation for the men and boys, Keble

encouraged cricket after Evensong on Sunday afternoons. From his own point of view it was an illustration of his practical rule for the observance of Sunday. "So far as you turn other days into Sunday, so far, and no farther, have you a right to turn Sunday into other days." But he heard that in certain quarters the practice gave offence, and it was accordingly discontinued.

The school, of course, was an important item in the pastoral work. Very often Mr. Keble would go in to teach his class of boys, while Mrs. Keble took the girls. On Sundays—and of this Keble made a great point—the senior scholars used to go to be catechized at the Vicarage, and in addition to this there was the catechizing on Wednesdays and Fridays, when all the school-children went to church. On those days the choir-boys, who also had to attend the afternoon service on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, wore holland tunics instead of, as on Sundays and Saints' Days, surplices. There is a letter extant to Miss Lampet, then mistress of the school, which shows how really Keble felt the responsibility of teaching. It is dated January 29, 1866, from Bournemouth, where he was spending the end of the winter with Mrs. Keble: "What can a teacher wish for more as a token of blessing on his work, than that the very thought of him, far off and away, should have power with the young hearts for God? I do

indeed long, if it pleases God, to be once more catechizing in your class-room."

The work in school and the catechizing in church were completed by the individual teaching of candidates for Confirmation. Generally the class was held in the study of the Vicarage ; sometimes, if labour was short upon the farm, so that the candidates could not be spared from their domestic duties in the daytime, Keble would make his way at night to the house in question and give instruction there. A few of the older parishioners of Hursley can still recall the picture of Keble, armed with cloak and lantern, coming in upon such an errand.

Part of the course consisted in the study of passages of Scripture, marked by Keble, in a Bible given by himself, upon which the pupils were examined on the next occasion. One of these pupils, now among the oldest inhabitants of Hursley, recounted with tears in her eyes the loss of "Keble's Bible" in a recent fire, as of one of her most valued possessions.

As far as might be, after Confirmation, control was still maintained by an insistence on a careful preparation for Communion, and, where required, by a recommendation of delay. In all these ways, assisted by systematic visiting, Keble endeavoured to restore to the parish Church its central position in the village world. To him the village, with its interests grouped round the parish Church, was a family, typical

of the larger family of the whole Church. A moral offence, therefore, committed by a member of the Hursley family, besides involving a violation of God's law, was also an outrage against the collective life of the parish.

It has been noticed how assiduously he strove to quicken the interests of his small community in the fortunes of the Church at large. With the same object too there would occasionally be a little meeting in the school, at which, with a few words of introduction from the Vicar, some worker in the mission-field would tell of his experiences.

It is a simple picture of the ordinary parish, drawn under no exceptional conditions, but at the same time marking the approach to an ideal. At all times there are many hindrances about the path of its attainment. The difficulties of the country districts are no less real than those that prevail in crowded centres of population, and frequently lay an even heavier burden upon the parish priest. For, being unperceived, they do not gain the sympathy which would otherwise be accorded to them. The casual passer-by is ignorant of their existence, and is too apt to dismiss the so-called "failure" of the country parish with an easy condemnation.

For the country priest, almost more than for any other, it is above all things necessary to keep the spark of enthusiasm from dying down. If personal zeal can be maintained, the heart will not indeed be proof against the

visits of despondency, but it will at least be able to refuse it a permanent lodgment.

A review of Monro's *Parochial Work* that Keble wrote for the *Christian Remembrancer*, in 1850, presents his own conception of the parish priest's vocation.¹

He insists on the obligation of the ministerial office: "From beginning to end a man seems to his own conscience to be exercising himself in great matters which are too high for him." Little good, he feels, can be effected without the help that personal intercourse alone can give. Hence, the disuse of private Sacramental Confession, other considerations apart, constitutes an overwhelming difficulty in the way of a priest, who is struggling to know his people; and without its revival it is impossible in that respect to look for any spiritual progress. On this matter Keble gave his opinion very clearly in one of the *Spiritual Letters* (xix): "We go on working in the dark, and in the dark it will be, until the rule of systematic Confession is revived in our Church. This is one of the things which make persons like Mr. Gladstone, however competent in most respects, yet on the whole, incompetent judges of the real working of our English system. They do not, they cannot, unless they were tried as we are, form an adequate notion how absolutely we are in our parishes like people whose lantern has blown out, and who are feeling their way, and

¹ *Occasional Papers and Reviews*, p. 338.

continually stepping in puddles and splotches of mud, which they think are dry stones."

The language is strong, almost bitter, and the words were clearly written in a mood of depression. But there is no reason to regard them as merely an overhasty expression of opinion, giving an exaggerated impression of his general thought and practice. Granted, says Keble, that the practice of Confession may contain possible dangers for certain souls, such as the tendency to seek for over-minute direction in the affairs of conscience: they can be guarded against, and in no sense do they detract from its great value. No practice rests upon more natural a footing. "Indeed the word 'cure' by itself tells its own story in this regard; who would think of being cared for, medically cared for, without telling his case to the physician?"¹ . . . "In this, as in almost all other respects, the Prayer Book will be found the best help. Its requirements cannot be carried out, in our dealings with either the sick or the whole, without bringing this matter, of opening their minds to the Priest, clearly before them."²

He was no less insistent on the duty of systematic parish-visiting, and, as a means of overcoming the bashfulness of either visitor or visited, he thought it might be helpful that the conversation should be prefaced by a short act of devotion.

¹ *Occasional Papers and Reviews*, p. 350. ² *Ibid.* p. 358.

The daily service in church, to which the children might be taken from the school, would set the background of devotion. Even if their avocations forbade the regular attendance of the grown-up members of the congregation, the knowledge that "the Church's monotonous song" was being untiringly performed, would assist them to discharge their daily duties.

But although, perhaps because, Keble was so much alive to the possibilities of winning souls, he was a prey at times to the keenest disappointment. It can be readily detected in many passages of his poems, and to Pusey he confided his sense of oppression at the contrast between his own parish and such as Monro's or Hook's. At Hursley there was "nothing done"; there seemed to be no pastoral confidence, no work that he could see going on.

But parochial occupations and anxieties, exacting as they were, only represented one branch of Keble's work at Hursley. Putting on one side his necessarily frequent interventions in the wider politics of the Church, much of his time must have been taken up with the giving of spiritual counsel and direction. Many people came to ask his advice in person; many communicated with him in writing; and it may be judged from the Spiritual Letters with what care the advice and sympathy they sought were given. The advice is seldom pressed, and frequently takes the form rather of suggestion than of practical direction. But this was only

the result of Keble's natural diffidence, which rendered him chary of obtruding his advice at all. Apart from answers elicited by particular inquirers upon specific points, he is more especially concerned with urging some of the broader considerations by which the progress of the spiritual life may be advanced and tried. In a field so complex detailed decisions must be left to individual initiative. The scheme of one may easily prove the occasion of his neighbour's fall. Circumstances vary, bringing endless diversity of opportunity; to each the voice of conscience interprets differently God's message. Each for himself must regulate his life by attuning it in all things to the will of God. The sovereign test is the degree to which this harmony can be attained: all other standards in comparison with this seem arbitrary and unreal. Constantly Keble warns his correspondents against too implicitly, or without careful scrutiny, accepting Emotion as a guide in matters of religion. The conscious fervour of devotion is a special gift from God, to be received with gratitude; but the recipient who perseveres in humble faith need not despair at its withdrawal. "Surely it is too high and blessed a gift to be tested or analysed by any emotions or by any reasoning of ours."¹ The withdrawal may be wholesome discipline; and should only stimulate to a still greater diligence

¹ *Spiritual Letters*, xxxv.

in prayer, and to a still more willing self-surrender to God's service.

This tone of balanced moderation, which was so peculiarly a feature of Keble's thought, decides his attitude towards the lighter things of life. There is no need for the earnest Christian to forgo the innocent amusements that this world can offer. The ascetic life is not for every one. Joy is a gift of God as certainly as grief. "I do not think," he writes,¹ "the glory of God best promoted by a rigid abstinence from amusements, except they be either sinful in themselves or carried to excess, or in some other way ministering occasion to sin. On the contrary, I believe there is more charity lost than there is sobriety gained by any unnecessary appearance of austerity. Self-denial seems to mean, not going out of the world, but walking warily and uprightly in it."

It was to Hursley too that many came who were troubled by the Roman claims, and wished to have their doubts resolved. Scarcely expecting in some cases to delay what seemed to be a foregone conclusion, Keble patiently reweighed the arguments of a too-familiar controversy. Sometimes the discussion moves along the somewhat pedantic lines of what may be thought to be the *criteria* of a Church's being. Allowing that the Roman Communion appears to exhibit in more clear relief than the English the note of Universality, can the same

¹ Spiritual Letters, xii.

be claimed for her with regard to the note of Sanctity? If not, it must in fairness be conceded that there is a *prima facie* case for some revision of an opinion formed on insufficient evidence. The question, he points out, cannot be summarily disposed of by the statement that the Church of England is in schism. Here again the arguments of undiluted logic require correction. That there is a schism is unfortunately clear, but to determine accurately how the blame must be apportioned requires a course of thought and study only within the power of few. "It seems to me," he wrote, "an extraordinary stretch of private judgment for a private Christian to condemn either." Yet on this process of apportionment of blame the whole position of the English Church depends. And therefore, for the ordinary individual, who lacks the aptitude or opportunity for independent study of the problem, the wiser course will be to remain where God has placed him, occupying himself with practical devotion. By so doing he will escape the unnecessary assumption of a responsibility for which he is ill-qualified, and he can rest assured that, if it be God's will to call him to another portion of His Church, the signs will be unmistakable.

For his own part, it is probable that, of the positive objections to be urged against the Roman system, Keble felt most keenly, and was most alive to, the weak points of

Newman's theory of Development. This much may be deduced from his insistence on the difficulties to which it led, by the partial substitution of Development for Tradition. History shows, and Keble frequently asserted, that the circumstances of the time might necessitate the definition of a point of doctrine previously undefined. By Newman's theory the door was opened to the elevation of what had been previously a pious opinion to the rank of an integral portion of the Church's faith. Between the two there is a wide distinction, and Keble saw the imperative necessity of fixing limitations to the working of the theory.

His conviction on this score, coupled with his rooted belief in that portion of the Church in which he had been born, made it impossible for Keble to regard a change of Communion as a matter of comparative indifference. For himself, he writes, it would be "wrong, fatally wrong," to take the step; and there is nothing in such expressions to conflict with his normal attitude of mind. Keble was under no temptation to rejoice at the discovery of, or to exaggerate, the points of weakness in Rome's position: as little, on the other hand, did he desire to minimize the real shortcomings of the Church of England. Until those were done away, she could not sit in judgment on her neighbours. And, while they remained, the members of the Church in England should

be on their guard against "such grief as throws off the blame of what is wrong from ourselves, on our condition, i.e. on God's Providence."¹ No single portion of the whole Church Catholic can disclaim interest in any other. Each portion of the Church must make allowance for the others; each must rest content with using to the best advantage its respective privileges. No good result is bred from mutual recrimination. Some day the chance would offer of enlisting the peculiar qualities of each in order to promote the common object of Reunion. But, for the present, individual transference of allegiance from one Communion to another only retarded the consummation of this hope.

As a preacher, Keble was not what the modern world would term effective. Although the voice was pleasant, there was nothing remarkable about the delivery except the preacher's obvious earnestness. Newman, however, has told how studiously Keble avoided anything that might by any possibility incur the charge of artificial striving for effect: "I recollect his borrowing a friend's sermon, which had been preached before the University; and, I suppose, had been well spoken of to him. When he returned it, he whispered into his friend's ear, 'Don't be original.' He practised himself the restraint which he recommended to others. On one occasion he preached

¹ *Spiritual Letters*, xxxiii.

a sermon in the University pulpit which made a great impression. Hurrell Froude and I left S. Mary's so touched by it, that we did not speak a word to each other all the way down to Oriel. He found out what we thought of it, and doubtless heard it praised in other quarters. His next sermon was a great disappointment to his hearers ; it was without unity, point, or effectiveness. Something occurred, I forget what, to explain to us how this came about. It arose from his vigilance over himself, and his scrupulousness lest in his former sermon he had so handled a sacred subject as to lead his audience to think rather of him than of it."

Great care was bestowed upon the preparation of the sermons ; some of the more important were written out in full ; others were preached from notes. In later life, apparently, as no notes of Parish Sermons after 1847 were found among his papers, he would seem to have used them less.

Froude once said that *The Christian Year* was "the best help to conceiving that we are really the people for whom such wonderful things have been done"; and the same holds true of Keble's sermons. Whether they were preached for some special object, or fell into the Church's course of seasons, they all lay stress upon the universality of the Divine scheme, as the clue to the puzzle bringing order out of chaos.

Here again, nothing is more noticeable than

the way in which exact perspective is preserved. Keble realized that it is often necessary to hold implicitly two truths that apparently conflict. Exalting one to the exclusion of the other will make religion one-sided. It is impossible, and the attempt must not be made, to separate the various attributes of God as He has chosen to reveal them. Love, Mercy, Justice, are all summed up in Him Who is Perfection : and each is a metaphor by which the human mind, according to its power, may attempt to interpret under several aspects the mystery of God's Being. The Day of Judgment, as Keble taught for instance in one of his Advent Sermons, must not be viewed apart from the Day of Crucifixion.

In this tone of moderation and of reverence, in language within the understanding of the simplest, Keble lays the great mysteries of the Christian Faith before his listeners. Where possible, the lesson is enforced by homely illustration, drawn from the every-day experience of his listeners. Perhaps a proverb of familiar use, or some event of local interest, may seem to point the preacher's meaning. By a reference to the Assizes in progress in the neighbouring city of Winchester, he seeks to bring more vividly before the mind the time when priest and people both will have to stand before the bar to receive judgment at the hands of a more dread Judge. The miraculous feeding of the Five Thousand assumes a more direct

significance for those, to whom the question of subsistence was a matter of almost daily anxiety. Under his hand each word of Scripture, with which he was so intimate, is made to yield its full content of meaning. In the sentence of the Comfortable Words, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy-laden," he draws from the word "all" the assurance that there are none excluded from the gracious invitation.

With Keble, as the sermons witness, the Creed is no abstract formula or lifeless symbol. On the contrary, it is intensely practical, alive, and touching human life at every point, forcing the individual soul by question and answer to rouse itself to a sense of its responsibilities. Nor is there any assured interval of leisure to warrant the postponement of the effort. "The best of us has a great deal to do, and the youngest will find he has but a short time." One of the *Miscellaneous Sermons* suggests the remedy that Keble thought the most effective for the curing of the fatal lethargy: "Once make up your mind never to stand waiting and hesitating when your conscience tells you what you ought to do, and you have got the key to every blessing that a sinner can reasonably hope for."

The world moves on: and its advance is only vaguely chronicled by lapse of years. Often it is only, as it were, by accident that the extent of the transition is observed. During

the time that Sir William Heathcote was the Squire of Hursley, with Keble as the Vicar, the *régime* would seem to have been one that can best be described by the name of a benevolent despotism. The relations of Vicar and Squire were typical of the ancient conception of harmonious co-operation between Church and State. Each recognized and respected the sphere in which the other was supreme ; but both alike were animated by the desire they had in common to promote the moral welfare of those committed to their charge. This was the general spirit of the administration of the place, expressing itself in many different ways. Tradition tells of one such instance, the authenticity of which cannot be guaranteed, but which is refreshing in its mediæval flavour. The rule was made that no two women should do their washing in the same house or yard, for fear that the simultaneous occupation might lead to undesirable results in the way of backyard gossip.

Despotisms, however, benevolent though they be, may well prove irksome to the more independent spirits ; and, among the personal impressions of Keble that remain, is that of a "severe man"—of unlimited sympathy for the sinner, but uncompromising in his condemnation of the sin.

A prophet is not without honour save in his own country. Miss Lampet remembers her surprise, on coming as schoolmistress

to Hursley, to find that Keble's wider reputation was not more fully recognized. Especially was she concerned to educate the children of the school to realize in this respect their privilege. But they were not to be convinced so easily, and wished for a comparative standard of merit by which to form their opinion. "Is the Vicar as clever as you, Miss Lampet? or as the Inspector?" Not satisfied with affirmative answers to their questions, they held the verdict in suspense; until one day they came to her with what they considered proof conclusive of Keble's second-rate ability. It turned out that in the Scripture lesson one of the girls had asked him how he pronounced "Balaam." Keble had hesitated about his answer, while repeating to himself the Hebrew syllables. Eventually he had inquired how Miss Lampet pronounced the word, and on being told, advised his questioner to do the same. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

Nor were the grown-up villagers much more sensible of the esteem in which their Vicar was held by the world outside. The average mind is seldom much impressed with anything beyond its own immediate surroundings. Their eyes were opened later. On the day of Keble's funeral one old man, wondering at the long line of carriages crowding each other in the village street, confessed that "'twas 'mazin what a sight some folks thought of the old gentleman." To

Hursley his death was almost like a revelation, and it is pleasant to know that, in the parish where he lived and worked, the name of John Keble, after more than forty years, is still a living influence.

The comparative neglect of the pastoral side of the Church's work in the eighteenth century had been the secret of much ground lost. The results of its revival have been no less remarkable upon the other side. In great measure these results may be ascribed to the lives of Keble and of others like him, who, in the gradual re-establishment of their ideal by force of personal example, have left their permanent mark upon the parish life of England.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

THE previous struggles, in which Keble's energies had been so liberally expended, had been concerned with the defence of doctrines involving the whole of the Sacramental system. In those particular attacks upon the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Holy Eucharist, the work of the defenders had been to maintain the right faith as against the wrong. But rationalism, which was now to be the enemy, stood upon somewhat wider ground.

The claim of reason to provide an exhaustive basis of thought and action, and the refusal to acknowledge the existence of any philosophy outside her own, contain a wider and more threatening danger than lies in any one specific heresy. For, unlike the ordinary heresy, the rationalistic spirit has no preference for one faith rather than another, but is impartially destructive of all faith alike.

In the pure scheme of rationalism, faith must perish. For the essence of faith consists in a bold venture into the unknown which

each must make for himself, bringing its own reward of certainty.

Such casting of bread upon the waters is unpalatable to reason. Failing to find the requisite scientific demonstration, it shrinks back from the venture to which faith would summon it. And thus, where nothing may be accepted that does not stand on scientific certainty, both the material and the opportunity of faith are gone.

The occasion of Keble's active intervention in this conflict was the appearance of the sometime famous, but now almost forgotten, volume of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860.

The essays chiefly responsible for the consternation that the book created were those touching the inspiration of the Bible, and the belief in the eternity of future punishment; and against the authors of these essays, proceedings were instituted in the Court of Arches. The Court condemned them; but, on appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Judgment was reversed.

In reply to this decision, a weighty declaration from Oxford, largely inspired by Pusey, was circulated and extensively signed in 1864. The Synodical condemnation of the book by both Houses of the Canterbury Convocation, which had been delayed pending the conclusion of the suit, followed a few months later.

These incidents have been for the most part relegated to oblivion by the lapse of years:

but, in so far as in their day the essays broadly represented the rationalistic temper, they are possessed of a more than passing interest.

And this was undoubtedly the character they bore for Churchmen of the time.

For Keble, the knowledge that it was this spirit of rationalism which prompted their composition, apart from the possible conclusions of such speculation, was decisive. With quaint seriousness, when writing to Moberly to borrow his copy of the book, he adds, "I cannot make up my mind either to buy, hire, or steal the book."

As long ago as 1826 he had expressed himself strongly to his sister about "persons who pretend to believe the Bible and yet don't believe in eternal punishment." Neither, it was evident, could these doubts about eternity be confined to the eternity of punishment: the words were of equal application to the doctrine of eternal happiness in heaven.¹ There could, he felt, be no greater instance of mistaken charity, or proof of indifference to what ought to be the guiding principles of the believer's attitude towards revealed truth, than the attempt to discount even a single one of "the severe but most Fatherly sayings, by which our loving LORD has revealed to us the issue of the broad way"; and these, with other similar passages of the Bible, he collected into a short "Litany of

¹ Cf. *The Christian Year*, poem for Second Sunday in Lent, "Esau's Forfeit."

our LORD's warnings" for use in church as a special intercession during the distress.

In his attitude upon the question Keble did no more than reflect the general mind of Church people. Those, who before had been in the most strenuous opposition to one another, were willing now to co-operate against the common enemy. "We shall have the Low Church with us now," wrote Pusey.

Alarm grows rapidly when nurtured on suspicion and uncertainty. There was an uncomfortable ring about the note prefixed to the essays by way of preface to the reader, with its reference to the advantages derivable "from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language and from traditional methods of treatment." No one could tell exactly what the essayists intended. Their language was obscure, and might mean much or little; their insinuations were for the most part veiled, and seemed to be thrown out almost at random. The defence was handicapped by the intangible nature of the attack.

But, if the book was inexcusably disturbing from its confusion of statement, argument, and vague suggestion, it was credited by its opponents with an importance out of all proportion to its worth.

And it is here, perhaps, that the episode contains a lesson valuable for all time, in recalling the distinction that exists between the

substance of revelation itself, and the formulæ by which from time to time it may be convenient to express it.

It is no matter for surprise that the distinction between the two has been often obscured, with the result, not infrequently, of suggesting an unnecessary antagonism between the respective claims of faith and reason.

Whereas the Truth itself is *ex hypothesi* unchanging, permanent, immovable, the terms in which it has been expressed may in course of time stand in need of explanation ; for the terms rightly used by one age may not be those best adapted to another. So long as the verbal definition continues to convey the impression that it was originally designed to give, it is discharging with fidelity the duty of acting as the exponent of the Truth, which without it is exposed to the uncertainties of such private interpretations, as each man may think best. But if, in course of time, the impression that the verbal definition gives is changed, this harmony is interrupted, and can only be re-established, when on each side there has been opportunity for calm and patient consideration.

On some points, therefore, the first impressions of the book may have been exaggerated ; and where this was so, a later generation may revise them. Many of the concrete conclusions of the essayists, moreover, were not so objectionable as was the *a priori* line of

thought from which they sprang. This was the real dividing-line. It may be hoped, however, that, with a fuller recognition of their mutual obligations, both faith and reason may have cause to appreciate more truly the value of each other's work, than has some times been the case in times past.

Reason, rightly conscious of its strength, seeks along many paths to lead man to the knowledge of himself; and, if faith be real, faith's children have no need to fear this manifold activity. Faith too, on the other side, can supply data, with which reason, to be reasonable, must reckon; for, without the inclusion of faith's contribution, reason's survey of human experience can never satisfy its object.

But it was not only in England that the Church was passing through troubled waters. South African affairs were also causing Keble great anxiety.

In 1853 two separate Bishoprics, Natal and Grahamstown, had been created out of the original diocese of Capetown. At the same time, Bishop Gray of Capetown, after a formal resignation of his See, was reappointed with the title of Metropolitan of South Africa, by Letters Patent of the Crown. The complications, which this method of appointment was to introduce, were for the time entirely unforeseen, and the new Bishops entered on their office with full knowledge of the position in

which they stood towards Gray by virtue of the new arrangement.

At first Colenso, the Bishop of Natal, worked in the utmost harmony with his Metropolitan : but the speculations, upon which the former felt himself compelled to enter, gradually made the maintenance of this relationship impossible.

In 1861, Colenso published his *Commentary on S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, and, in the course of the next two years, his critical examination of the Pentateuch. The stir caused by these publications was immediate and widespread. With regard to the Bishop's writings on the Pentateuch, it should be borne in mind that fifty years ago biblical criticism was in its infancy. The critics themselves still needed time to sift their own conclusions ; while, on the other hand, some of the fears that they evoked, viewed in the light of fuller knowledge, may seem to-day to have been strained and fanciful. But, even to an age accustomed to face criticism calmly, Colenso's treatment of his subject must have been disquieting.

More serious than his handling of the Pentateuch had been his earlier volume on the *Romans*. This, in the opinion of Bishop Gray, bristled throughout with heresies, involving cardinal points of Christian doctrine, such as the Atonement, and necessitated the frank abandonment of the whole Sacramental system.

In 1863 Colenso was presented on the

charge of heresy, and in December, after a full hearing of the case, the Metropolitan pronounced his deposition, giving him till April, 1864, to retract, or, if he could, to explain the offending statements.

In the succeeding June (1864) the appeal, that Colenso had made to the Crown, was referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, by which, in March, 1865, the action of the Bishop's Court at Capetown was reversed. The ground of this revision was that it was outside the province of the Crown to confer coercive jurisdiction, by the sole authority of Letters Patent, in any colony having responsible legislative institutions. As, therefore, Cape Colony had possessed representative government when the Metropolitan See had been erected, in the eye of the law the holder of this See was merely a Bishop, with no local coercive authority or jurisdiction.

The whole question of the appeal to the civil court was itself one of more than doubtful legality, and Gray insisted always that the understanding, upon which the Province had been founded, was that appeals should lie from the Metropolitan to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to no other quarter. Moreover, by the principles on which Gray's action had been taken, the proceedings of the Privy Council were irrelevant. The Church had summoned him to a spiritual office; and had endowed him with the jurisdiction appertaining to it. The

point put forward by the Privy Council might invalidate his legal status; for his spiritual rights and duties he was responsible to the authority alone, by which they had been conferred. Whatever claims might, on Erastian principles, be advanced against the Church in England, through an inadequate appreciation of the meaning of "Establishment," they were obviously out of place in Africa. For there the Church was in no sense "established," and its relations with the State were merely those of any other voluntary religious association.

When, therefore, fortified by the issue of his appeal, Colenso revisited his diocese, Gray never hesitated in what he conceived to be the path of duty. On January 5, 1866, the sentence of excommunication was formally pronounced, and Gray began to take the necessary steps preliminary to the appointment of another in Colenso's place.

The story of the miserably protracted schism in Natal outlived by many years the history of Keble's life; but, while he was alive, he entered most keenly into Bishop Gray's perplexities. "Dear Mr. Keble," Gray writes in December, 1863, "is the only one that has as yet helped me." Later, however, thanks in no small degree to Bishop Wilberforce, the rulers of the Church in England espoused Gray's cause more warmly.

Keble, throughout, was one of those to whom

Gray looked especially for guidance, and from whose constant approbation he derived support.

Keble on his side had the greatest possible respect for Gray. He reckoned him the greatest of Colonial Bishops, a real Confessor of the Faith. "You do indeed set us an example of not slumbering or sleeping," he wrote, when the trouble was just beginning; and the spirit of Gray's Charge in 1864 impressed him greatly: "It is wonderful; it is like a piece out of the fourth century; it is really noble."

A letter, that he wrote to Gray in 1864, may show how clearly he perceived the struggle to be one, in which the Church in England too was vitally concerned. Spiritual independence of the Privy Council was the common end; at the same time prudent tactics should, he thought, be tried, liberty of action being reserved in the event of failure.

"I could wish," he writes, "that it might be found possible to mitigate instead of defying the Queen's Supremacy; and, while you decline to plead on the question of deprival, obtain a real Church check upon the appointment of a successor, still keeping (as it were by way of a rod in your pocket) the resolution to renounce the Supremacy if it be so intolerably abused. . . . We on our side *must*, and I doubt not *shall*, adopt it as our own cause, and make the Government understand that it will be a *casus belli* for them to pretend to reverse such

a sentence as yours. . . . But, after all, referring matters to the Bishops, with whatever help, would hardly set us right, unless we could mend the *Bishop-makers* : *there* eventually will be the tug of war."

He himself assisted liberally with the expenses that Gray had to bear, and they corresponded constantly up to the time of Keble's death, which, in the opinion of Mr. Justice Coleridge, was hastened by the Colenso trouble. Often in his letters Keble reiterated the thought that was so constantly before him : bad principles are like temptations — before they can be harmful they must be willingly accepted. Protest, even if to all appearance it be barren of result, keeps the protester, whether Church or individual, pure. And although the distress in Africa, as has been said, survived by many years the term of Keble's life, time and experience have proved the wisdom of his words.

Latterly much of Keble's leisure had been devoted to the preparation of his *Life of Bishop Wilson*. The time and care, that he thought necessary to give to it, had been serious obstacles to any other literary endeavours. They had prevented him from yielding to Pusey's appeal to undertake a *Commentary on St. John* ; and Keble's friends were inclined to blame the pious Bishop, for depriving them of any solid work from Keble's pen upon more general subjects. At last, after sixteen years

of work, and more than one visit to the Isle of Man, the *Life* was published in 1863, showing on every page the affection which inspired the undertaking.

Seldom has a biographer been in more thorough sympathy with the subject he had chosen. To what extent this is the case may generally be gauged by giving rein to the imagination in transposing the position. Let subject become author, and let author take the place of subject. Often the process is unthinkable: but here the reader feels that, even if this inversion were effected, no outrage would be perpetrated. Scenes would be shifted, but the spirit of the book would be unchanged. For all the points of interest were common; the chart by which each steered was the same.

The comprehensive discipline, which Bishop Wilson practised in his island-diocese, his championship of spiritual rights in face of temporal usurpations, appeared to Keble as the reproduction of the mediæval struggles, and gave encouragement to those who in later days had to wage again with other weapons the battle of the Church's spiritual independence.

Keble was not unconscious of the difficulties inherent in the treatment of this subject. As long ago as 1849 he wrote, "I see plainly that to write Bishop Wilson's *Life* one ought to have well made up one's mind on the theory of Persecution—which I never yet did distinctly. Such an one as Froude might do it." But the

very difficulty to which Keble here refers would be alluring to one, who in the preface to the *Chila's Christian Year*, published in 1841, expressed the opinion that the restoration of Church discipline was the only Church reform worthy of the name.

The story of Wilson's unbroken episcopate in Man is certainly remarkable. Appointed in 1697, the Bishop served at his post until his death in 1755. His time in the Isle was taken up with all the many duties, as he conceived them, of a Pastoral Bishop. He supervised the repair of churches, gave counsel and advice to his clergy, maintained the discipline, and enforced it upon offenders by all the censures of the Church, was actively interested himself, and sought to interest others, in Missions to the heathen. Time too was found for the discharge of diverse duties of a more mundane description—such as supporting the efforts of his flock to obtain redress of constitutional grievances, the establishment of libraries, the fostering of agriculture, and the organizing of relief in times of stress and famine. But the interest of his life is mainly centred in the discipline. The spirit of the earlier days, with its acknowledgement of spiritual jurisdiction, was still strong, and for a while, with the assistance of the secular authority, a definite system of Church punishments for spiritual offences continued in full vigour. In time the system, which relied for

moral weight on faith, and for its practical enforcement on the civil power, was weakened, and declined. But this was only gradual. Meanwhile, behind the Bishop's versatile activity, there lay the life of personal devotion, revealed in rules of charity and every-day observance, erected on the constant recollection of the Presence of God, Whose work it was his privilege to do.

Nor was his fame confined within the borders of his diocese. Cardinal Fleury sent over "to enquire after his health, his age, and the date of his consecration ; as they were the two oldest Bishops, and, he believed, the poorest, in Europe " ; and, out of respect for its Bishop, issued orders to protect the Isle of Man from the attacks of French privateers.

Wilson too was a notable exception to the spirit of his age, in never looking for a change from that spot where his fortunes had been cast. In 1735, on one of the occasions when he went to Court (so the story goes), Queen Caroline turned round and said, " See here, my Lords, is a Bishop who does not come for a translation." " No, indeed, an't please your Majesty," was the answer ; " I will not leave my wife in my old age because she is poor."

No trifles are too insignificant to lend their testimony, and the fulness, with which Keble traced the Bishop's fortunes, shows how completely the task was one of love. But the

detail, interesting as it is, is sometimes excessive, and has the effect of overcrowding and partially obscuring the main narrative. At the same time the picture which, thanks to Keble's diligence and care, the book provides, is probably unique.

During the time in which Keble had been engaged upon *Bishop Wilson's Life*, death had been busy among his friends. At the end of 1858, he wrote to Pusey, "What a season this has been for the departure of old friends!—John Miller, Ellison, C. Marriott, W. Barter, and, as I have just heard, Frank Dyson. The tide seems fast encroaching on one's island; pray, my dear friend, that one may be ready." Affecting him more closely still had been the death of his sister Elizabeth in August, 1860. Naturally of a frail constitution, and for many years an invalid, she impressed the visitors at the Vicarage by her gentle patience and content. Like Keble, she was a good Dante scholar, and used to enjoy taking part in the literary discussions, towards which conversation in the evenings sometimes turned. Spending so large a proportion of her time at Hursley, she was always ready, as far as her strength permitted, to assist her brother in his work; and her loss was consequently almost like a withdrawal of part of his own life. She had been, as he said to Coleridge, when writing to announce her death, "for twenty years of health and fifty of sickness, always at

hand, or always within reach ; and never a look, nor a word, that I know of, but was wise and kind with the true kindness and wisdom. Only it makes an old man's heart sink to reflect what one might have been, with such helps, and many, many more, and what one really is."

The strain of nursing her had told upon Mrs. Keble, never strong, and after Miss Keble's death, Keble decided to take his wife to Dawlish. The experiment of change was moderately successful, and was tried again in the following summers by visits to the Isle of Wight. But it was from the Hursley winter that the danger came ; and in 1862 the doctor's orders were imperative that Keble should take her to some warmer climate. From this time onwards, migration for the winter to the south became an annual necessity. In 1862-3 they were at Penzance ; most of the next winter they spent at Torquay, moving on to Penzance in the spring of 1864. In both places they made many friends, and from time to time their old friends paid them welcome visits ; although both health and inclination precluded much in the way of entertainment or society. Torquay reminded Keble much of Oxford : "It is the only other place in England where the church bells are going all day."

During their various protracted absences from Hursley, Keble did what he could in the

way of helping with the work of neighbouring parishes ; but the enforced idleness made him think seriously of whether he ought not to resign his cure. He yielded, however, to the reassurances of his friends upon the matter, and the time was but short before the question was decided for him.

The first warning of the end came on the evening of St. Andrew's Day, 1864, in the shape of a slight paralytic stroke, while he was writing in his study at Hursley. With the exception, however, of making him more shaky—a change especially noticeable in his handwriting—the effect, as far as could be seen, passed off, and his mind remained as clear as it had ever been. Indeed, by the middle of December it was possible to make the journey from Hursley to Torquay, *en route* for Penzance, which was reached once more in January, 1865.

By the end of May Keble was back at Hursley for the summer, where he remained till after October 10th, his wedding day, which he wished to spend at home. The following day he and Mrs. Keble said good-bye for the last time to Hursley, and started for Bournemouth.

It is pleasant to recall the interview that had taken place at Hursley shortly before between Keble, Pusey, and Newman. The story may, perhaps, be told in full from the account which the last-named of the three supplied at the request of Sir John Coleridge :

“ REDNALL,

“ *Sept.* 17, 1868.

“ DEAR SIR JOHN COLERIDGE,

“ I must begin by apologizing for my delay in acknowledging your letter of the 10th. Owing to accidental circumstances, my time has not been my own ; and now, when at length I write, I fear I shall disappoint you in the answer which alone I can give to your question. It almost seems to me as if you were so kind as to wish me to write such an account of my visit to Mr. Keble as might appear in your Memoir ; but, as I think you will see, my memory is too weak to allow of my putting on paper any particulars of it which are worth preserving. It was remarkable, certainly, that three friends, he, Dr. Pusey, and myself, who had been so intimately united for so many years, and then for so many years had been separated, at least one of them from the other two, should meet together just once again ; and, for the first and last time, dine together simply by themselves. And the more remarkable because not only by chance they met all three together, but there were positive chances against their meeting.

“ Keble had wished me to come to him, but the illness of his wife, which took them to Bournemouth, obliged him to put me off. On their return to Hursley I wrote to him on the subject of my visit, and fixed a day for it.

Afterwards, hearing from Pusey that he too was going to Hursley on the very day I had named, I wrote to Keble to put off my visit. I told him, as I think, my reason. I had not seen either of them for twenty years, and to see both of them at once would be more, I feared, than I could bear. Accordingly, I told him I should go from Birmingham to friends in the Isle of Wight, in the first place, and thence some day go over to Hursley. This was in September, 1865. But when, on the 12th, I had got into the Birmingham train for Reading, I felt it was like cowardice to shrink from the meeting, and I changed my mind again. In spite of my having put off my visit to him I slept at Southampton and made my appearance at Hursley next morning without being expected. Keble was at his door speaking to a friend. He did not know me, and asked my name. What was more wonderful, since I had purposely come to his house, I did not know him, and I feared to ask who it was. I gave him my card without speaking. When at length we found out each other, he said, with that tender flurry of manner which I recollected so well, that his wife had been seized with an attack of her complaint that morning, and that he could not receive me as he should have wished to do ; nor, indeed, had he expected me ; for ‘Pusey,’ he whispered, ‘is in the house, as you are aware.’

“Then he brought me into his study and

embraced me most affectionately, and said he would go and prepare Pusey and send him to me.

“I think I got there in the forenoon and remained with him four or five hours, dining at one or two. He was in and out of the room all the time I was with him, attending on his wife, and I was left with Pusey. I recollect very little of the conversation that passed at dinner. Pusey was full of the question of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and Keble expressed his joy that it was a common cause in which I could not substantially differ from them, and he caught at such words of mine as seemed to show agreement. Mr. Gladstone’s rejection at Oxford was talked of, and I said that I really thought that had I been still a member of the University I must have voted against him, because he was giving up the Irish Establishment. On this Keble gave me one of his remarkable looks, so earnest and so sweet, and came close to me, and whispered in my ear (I cannot recollect the exact words, but I took them to be), ‘And is not that just?’ It left the impression on my mind that he had no great sympathy with the Establishment in Ireland as an Establishment, and was favourable to the Church of the Irish.

“Just before my time for going Pusey went to read the Evening Service in Church, and I was left in the open air with Keble by himself. He said he would write to me in the Isle of Wight as soon as his wife got better, and then

I should come over and have a day with him. We walked a little way, and stood looking in silence at the Church and Churchyard, so beautiful and calm. Then he began to converse with me in more than his old tone of intimacy, as if we had never been parted ; and soon I was obliged to go.

"I remained in the island till I had his promised letter. It was to the effect that his wife's illness had increased, and he must give up the hopes of my coming to him. Thus, unless I had gone on that day, when I was so very near not going, I should not have seen him at all.

"He wrote me many notes about this time ; in one of them he made a reference to the lines in *Macbeth* :

‘When shall we three meet again?—
When the hurly-burly’s done,
When the battle’s lost and won.’

"This is all I can recollect of a visit, of which almost the sole vivid memory which remains with me is the image of Keble himself.

"I am, dear Sir John Coleridge,

"Yours faithfully,

"JOHN H. NEWMAN.

"Sir John Coleridge, etc., etc."

After their arrival at Bournemouth in October, Mrs. Keble's condition gave cause for increased

anxiety, and she was evidently weaker ; but up to March, Keble's own health seemed not to warrant any great uneasiness.

But the general expectation that she would be taken first was not to be fulfilled. For him the end came quickly. On March 22nd he had what probably was another paralytic seizure, and, after only a short week's serious illness, died in the early morning of March 29, 1866.

A week later, on April 6th, he was buried at Hursley, in a corner of the Churchyard by the Vicarage walk, where, exactly six weeks later, Mrs. Keble was laid beside him.

Immediately after the funeral on April 6th a few friends met together at Sir William Heathcote's house to consider the question of some memorial, of which the outcome was the College bearing Keble's name in Oxford, opened in 1870—the greatest monument to a single individual that England has known for many a long year.

The prevalent idea of Keble's personal appearance is drawn from the print of Richmond's picture of him, painted in 1843 by the desire of Mr. Justice Coleridge. A letter to his brother shows that Keble liked the process of sitting for his picture as much, or as little, as other fellow-sufferers before and since : "When I can afford it, I fully mean to send Mr. Richmond to Bisley, on the principle of the fox that had lost his tail, that you may all be made to look smug and simpering like myself."

In this drawing he appears erect, square-shouldered, and of medium height, with pleasant features, irregular but well-defined, a well-shaped forehead, and eyes in which may be detected something of his natural merri-ment, set deep under heavy eyebrows.

The photograph, from which the frontispiece to this volume is reproduced, was taken in 1864. As is natural, advancing years have left their trace. The hair, which had at first been almost black, has become white, and the original uprightness has been lost, the head and shoulders being carried lower than in the days of Richmond's portrait. Failing sight too made necessary the use of spectacles, which were not infrequently mislaid, and only discovered after much search pushed back to the top of the searcher's head.

But for these changes, the main lines of the features are the same in both the portraits, and a study of either will support the personal impression that was left on those who were admitted to the inner circle of acquaintance. A gentleness, susceptible at times of transformation into disapproving sternness, a warmth of feeling that created and cemented friendships, a natural courtesy, at times disguised by an equally natural reserve—such are still some of the broader traits of character, that emerge from a study of his likeness and his life.

Of that life few words are required to gather up the threads; and, in doing so, it will be

possible to deal with one or two of the adverse judgments that have been passed upon it.

As is often the case, some of these judgments are mutually conflicting. In some minds the impression, that survives a study, often somewhat cursory, of events contemporary with Keble's life, is that he and the party that he represented were, through their insistence on the importance of a right belief, intolerant fanatics. Those who think thus will point to such incidents as the Hampden controversies, although the responsibility for these was, it may be repeated, in no way confined to any one party or section of the Church. Or they recall the unqualified resistance that Keble offered to the alteration of the Marriage Laws in 1857. With curious inconsistency, some are prepared to endorse the principles on which that resistance was based, while deprecating the conclusions which those very principles entail. It may be admitted, for instance, that it is not unreasonable for Churchmen to object to the tampering by the State with the law of Christian Marriage; but, when Churchmen convert their protests into terms of practical opposition by a revival of Church discipline, and insist on the duty of repelling from the Church's Sacraments those who contravene the Church's law, they are forthwith regarded as extreme, unreasonable, and as causing unnecessary disturbance to society at large.

If more special instances of alleged intoler-

ance are required, attention can be directed to the opposition to the endowment of the Greek Chair, when held by Jowett, or to Keble's refusal to preach in Westminster Abbey at the invitation of Dean Stanley, for fear that such action might be taken to imply approval of the Dean's opinions.

It is not altogether easy for the present generation to judge truly in these matters, for in one respect, at all events, the prevailing thought of to-day represents a very considerable departure from the ideas of fifty years ago.

One feature of this change consists in the increased facility with which men nowadays have learnt to recognize conflicting rules of life, and to allot to each the control of a certain sphere of action. In this sense it is a reflection in the case of the individual, of the change that has been taking place in the relations of Church and State.

Formerly a man was not so expert in this process, and was accustomed to go through life more simply, yielding an undivided allegiance to a single principle. The theory of Persecution, if the word is to be applied to the matters in question, justified itself by the general acquiescence in the position that a right faith was everything. Opinions might, and did, differ as to what the right faith was; and each side had resort impartially to the customary methods for the insistence on what it believed to be the truth, and for the

conversion of its opponents to its own view. Then followed toleration, primarily as a matter of political expediency, because it was found in the first place that persecution was practically impossible, and, next, that it was apt to defeat its own ends, and was therefore undesirable. The new attitude of toleration was further reinforced by the deeper consideration that truth is not objective only, but that it has a subjective side as well. The broad result of this revolution in opinion for the ordinary man was that life was no longer so simple or straightforward. He constantly found himself being torn in two between principles diametrically opposite. On the one side, he held as firmly as ever he had done to his own convictions. On the other, it was forced upon him that there were large numbers of good and worthy persons among his fellow-creatures, to whom respect was due, who were equally assured that his convictions were erroneous.

Hence, for convenience' sake, the faculty has been acquired of drawing distinctions between the principles which should govern different departments of life, and of separating between them. What is not possible for a man as a member of the Church is not impossible, nay, may be even right, for him in his capacity as a citizen.

The thought of the present day has been deeply influenced by this leavening process, and finds it easy to reconcile what might at first

sight seem contradictory. It is permissible to think that the leaven has spread too far ; it may be that the reaction from the wish to insist on a rigid uniformity has led to an undue loosening of the bands upon the other side. Each age is apt to think that, though an uncompromising course of action may have been necessary and good for its predecessor, and eminently to be desired of its successor, it is scarcely a policy to be recommended immediately for itself. Such an attitude demands a careful scrutiny. For, be it clearly said, those, to whom their principles mean anything, can never act as if they were non-existent, while it is only those who possess principles themselves, who are likely to comprehend the existence of the principles of other people.

Real liberty is not licence. Rather is it the attainment, by a regulated following of law, of that vantage-ground from which the perspective of the lower plains may be discerned, and conflicting duties more easily harmonized.

To the majority of human beings this frame of mind does not come naturally. Indeed its acquisition postulates a rigid self-restraint in matters of daily life. When man first realizes that he is called upon to play the part of fellow-worker with God, his natural instinct will be to dread the intrusion of the human within the pale of the Divine. But as this very intrusion is his privilege, he will perpetually remind himself that he is a man

of unclean lips, mysteriously set upon the threshold of Heaven. Hence necessarily springs humility, well termed the only ladder which will reach to Heaven.

In a marked degree this attitude was Keble's. As he wrote after the Hampden controversies and the formation of Church Unions, "Somehow it rather frightens me to think of the great stone which in a manner we set a-rolling the other day ; not that I, at all, repent of it ; only it seems a kind of work only fit for real good people."

In his private life this diffidence was even more defined. Its influence on his giving of spiritual counsel and direction has been already noticed. In his own mind, it made him deeply sensible of his own shortcomings, so much so that he has been charged with morbidness. It is presumptuous for the outsider to attempt to hold the scales in the discussion between God and individual souls. Could he but see with the eyes of those whom he would judge, his advice might be other than it is. It will be time enough for him to speak, when the so-called morbidness that he condemns has drifted into despair, and has begun to dry the springs of hope and energy. In the case of Keble this was never so. With him the feeling was the inevitable result of a vivid consciousness of the true relationship in which man stands to his Creator—the consciousness that comes with the piercing of the veil of

sin. The impulse was never in the direction of an impotent abandonment, but rather towards a more strenuous renewal, of the struggle. This quality of self-restraint, based on his natural humility, was the parent of that reverence which is so marked a feature of his poetry, and of that spirit which, for example, always caused him, before reading the Bible, to close his eyes for an instant in silent prayer.

To the prominence of this gentler side of Keble's character is due perhaps the legend that has grown up round his name that he was a mild old gentleman who wrote poetry, drawn at the heels of friendship, and accidentally, into the struggles of his time. He himself was impatient at being placed among the poets. "I wish," he said, when he was publishing his treatise on *Eucharistical Adoration*, "that people, instead of paying me compliments about what they call my poetry, would see if there is not some sense in my prose."

Nor would it appear that he always presented to contemporary judgment that character of moderation with which he has been invested by a latter-day tradition. "Remember," said Mr. Norris, of Hackney, to the Rev. Robert Wilson, who had been offered the curacy of Hursley, "if you become Keble's curate you will lose all chance of preferment for life."

In an earlier chapter¹ it was pointed out how zealously he ranked himself alongside

¹ Chapter vi.

any who were attacked in the Church's cause. Disliking controversy as he did, he never attempted to stand aloof when principles were at stake. And the advice given, as has been seen, was by no means always meek, or along the lines of least resistance. "Remember," he would say in later years, when Pusey was attacked, "I am a Puseyite of the deepest dye." There was nothing hesitating or half-hearted in his handling of the two great controversies of his time with the State—the jurisdiction of the Privy Council and the alteration of the Marriage Law. And it is noteworthy that on the first of these, the Privy Council, the principle of spiritual independence, for which he struggled, has won general, if tardy, recognition. On the other, round which there still appears to linger some confusion, a rational understanding can only be approached by the frank admission of the same principle, that within the spiritual sphere no action of the temporal power can abrogate the Church's law. That Keble was ready to allow due weight to the counsels of charity and prudence in their own place is attested by the letter he wrote to the *Literary Churchman* shortly before he died. After alluding to current controversies, and remarking upon the uncompromising opposition with which usurpations of the Temporal Courts in spiritual matters must be met, he touched on some of the points that have become more prominent since his death. With regard to

the Ornaments Rubric—although he probably never wore vestments himself—he claimed that, on the ground of Catholic principle and history, “the *onus probandi* lies in this matter upon the many who practically ignore or slight the usages (of which number I must confess myself to be one) rather than upon the few who have regularly maintained or recently adopted them. I do indeed regret the disregard of that rubric as a real blemish in our ecclesiastical practice—a contradiction to our theory, less momentous but quite as real as our almost entire disuse of the discipline of JESUS CHRIST, our obligation to which, nevertheless, we formally acknowledge. But as in the latter case, so in this, the time and manner of regaining the old paths must under our circumstances be a question of equity and charity, not of strict law alone. I, for one, rejoice, whenever and wherever I see that kind of revival successfully and tranquilly accomplished.”

Keble in the same way, while recognizing to the full the cogency of the universal rule and custom of the Church as to fasting Communion, did not ignore the past history of the Church of England, and the laxity on the subject, which in later times had become so general. For these reasons, he deprecated a too rigorous and absolute enforcement of the rule, involving as he thought a lack of due consideration for the aged and infirm and for

what might be the real difficulties of others. Similarly with regard to non-communicating attendance he gives a warning against "urging all men indiscriminately to be present at the Holy Mysteries." The danger that he foresaw was lest people should rest content with this, and end by substituting attendance for the fuller realization, through Communion, of the sacramental life in CHRIST. As long as the due proportion was preserved, and Communion rightly regarded as the highest aim and object of the spiritual life, there need be, as the directions for spiritual Communion in the Spiritual Letters show, no anxiety about the possible misuse of non-communicating attendance, to deter those, who are so privileged, from its enjoyment. In these and similar matters Keble would have uttered a word of warning. Charity, he would have said, must make allowance for present ignorance and past neglect. The difficulty, of course, consists in gauging truly what are fit subjects of concession. This difficulty, great enough in any case, is intensified by the absence of any absolute measure by which to work. For matters, in themselves of little moment, may easily come to stand for the expression, or the denial, of some vital principle.

This constant process of permutation, affecting the relations of ideas and things, renders it precarious work to dogmatize too nicely as to what people would have done, if they had lived in circumstances other than

they did. The enquirer must content himself, as far as may be, with proceeding by analogy, and must deduce his conclusions upon general rather than on more particular grounds. So judged, Keble can scarcely be claimed as an example of unquestioning obedience to episcopal authority. It was not on such lines that he dealt with his own Diocesan in the matter of his curate—Peter Young—or with the Scottish Bishops in the case of Bishop Forbes (of Brechin), or with Bishop Wilberforce (of Oxford) in the affair of Pusey's inhibition. Neither, it may be added, was it by the methods of unquestioning submission to episcopal direction that the vindication of doctrine and practice, to which his life was given, was achieved.

Critics have commented upon the strange anomaly involved in the action of men, who laid such stress on the authority of Bishops, and yet so frequently appeared in practice to contradict their professions. But the anomaly is more apparent than real. For the major premiss in the argument—that obedience is due to Bishops—is necessarily conditional. All obedience to authority postulates conditions. Speaking generally, the authority of the parent over the child is absolute ; but it is also clear that cases might well arise in which the child would be amply justified in disregarding it. So in the case of Bishops. Obedience is due to them as to Bishops of the Catholic Church, but it follows that the condition under which

obedience may be claimed, and must be given, is that they should acknowledge and respect the rules of the body from which their authority is derived.

Such were some of the common points at which Keble's temperament and principles touched and reacted on each other. Reverence for the old, dislike of things new, made it indubitable that his sympathies in matters of religion would be Catholic, and cast him back in the middle of contemporary difficulties upon what he regarded as his sheet-anchor — the ancient consent of the Universal Church. At the same time allowance must be made, in the cause of charity, for past mistakes. "Dissenters," he used to say, "should be dealt with lovingly and forbearingly, as being, alas ! the wronged party in bygone times."

In the world of politics the same Catholic instinct, that underlay his great personal regard for Mr. Gladstone, made him a Tory, to whom the utilitarian creed was something worse than an insufficient economic formula.

Liberalism, whether in politics or in the affairs of the Church, was, from the beginning to the end, distasteful to him ; at times, it was almost more than he could do to argue patiently with its disciples, a fact which explains an Oriel tradition that he was hot-tempered. In his eyes, the Liberal school of thought, in Church matters at least, was the product of the tendency to refuse to walk except by sight, instead of accepting

with humility the promptings of a simple faith. Diffidence in himself, respect for authority and tradition, made the Church in his eyes a living safeguard against the excesses of untrammelled Private Judgment, in which he recognized the logical conclusion of pure Protestantism.

From such soil sprang his admiration for Sir Walter Scott ; hence also his devotion to the Stuart dynasty, and his respectful affection for "our own, our royal saint," Charles I, whose death he described as a "real martyrdom" in the truest sense of the word.

There is an interesting letter of 1828 to his brother, in which he takes Bishop Butler to task on this subject : "What a very decided way of talking about the Pretender our friend Bishop Butler had in 1747, even calling him by that nickname in a sermon. Well, nobody is perfect. Also Mr. Bonnell,¹ in 1688-9, seems to have had no scruples whatever. I see one must forget and forgive."

The faculty of balanced judgment upon a careful review of the *data*, and, what is frequently of almost greater value, the power of being content with a suspended judgment in presence of opposing premisses, enabled Keble to avoid the pitfalls in the path of the less patient thinker. And this indeed remains the most indelible characteristic of his thought. Such habit of mind, on account of the stern

¹ James Bonnell (1653-99), a Cambridge scholar of distinction ; probably a Non-juror.

self-discipline through which alone it is acquired, is not the least of the distinctive marks of sanctity ; and something has been seen of the peculiar strength that it conferred on Keble's theology.

To the human intellect it may often seem to be impossible to reconcile two truths—such, for example, as the truth of GOD's foreknowledge and the fact of man's free-will. And, unless it can be ungrudgingly admitted that there may be limits to the operation of the ordinary human laws of sequence and connexion, the temptation to deny one truth in order to retain the other will, in all likelihood, be irresistible. Keble, however, is one of those who point to a more excellent way. Of the first truth—Divine Foreknowledge—faith in an omniscient GOD, for Whom time is non-existent, will be the best and most convincing proof: to the reality of the second—man's free-will—the daily personal experience of the individual, conscious of power of choice, bears undying witness.

From this mould flowed in practice Keble's power of discernment of relative proportions, and of nice discrimination between the essential and the non-essential points of a position. For this reason he could bow to the requirements of the moment upon points that were not vital, in order to urge with greater force the acknowledgement of those that were. The result in certain cases was that some of less

discriminating judgment were inclined to underestimate his fighting qualities. Even among his own friends there were a few at such times as the Gorham case, who were dissatisfied with Keble's perpetual attitude of protest, and warmly favoured some more energetic policy.

But to Keble hasty action was the height of folly. As he once wrote to Moberly, "Hurry is essentially a cruel thing." There are few things more dangerous than the constant anxiety for doing something definite. Many diseases may only be handled with gentleness and caution ; violent treatment, the determination to force an issue at all costs, will result in nothing but catastrophe.

The advocates of heroic measures should also recollect that although principles may be ignored or slighted, or even for the moment apparently destroyed, nothing can really affect them, as long as their holders retain their faith in those principles and in themselves. Nor is it always possible to do anything but defend in face of an attack. The only people who seemed to do anything definite in those years were Newman, and Manning, and those who followed them to Rome. That Keble refused to be coerced into this kind of action, but was content to possess his soul in patience, and to appear in the eyes of the great majority of the undiscerning to do nothing, is the best tribute to his memory.

Few people, on the other hand, were less of the blind conservative wedded to inaction. A fact, that is not without its interest here, is that when *The Church Times* was started as a penny paper in 1863, in order to popularize Church principles, Pusey opposed, while Keble was in favour of, the venture. On one of the main Church questions—disestablishment—he thought calmly and spoke clearly, that the point could easily be reached, at which it would devolve upon Church people to agitate for such a change. But he could not disregard, or recklessly promote, the tearing-up of roots, set deeply in the past, that might be involved in such departure. Yet it need hardly be said that for “Establishments”—the meaning of which word under modern conditions he confessed he imperfectly understood—he had no enthusiasm. For the majority, however, disestablishment means little apart from its concrete accompaniment of disendowment, and this Keble would have strenuously resisted. The loss of property might be a matter of comparative indifference to the Church itself; but this would not affect the fact that those responsible for the spoliation would most certainly in his eyes be guilty of the sin of sacrilege.

In connexion with this subject, some of Keble's relatives have thought that Cardinal Newman had, in the account already quoted, of the last interview with Keble at Hursley,

given an unintentionally wrong impression of the view that Keble took of Mr. Gladstone's action in disestablishing the Irish Church. Upon the strength of that account Mr. Gladstone himself, writing at a later date, claimed for his policy that it had been approved by Keble. But Keble's relations were of opinion that even if the words were correctly transmitted by Cardinal Newman, their meaning would rather be that the Irish Church might be justly punished for her shortcomings, without justifying those who, under God, were allowed to be the instruments of that retribution.

On the other hand, he might well have used the expression about the Established Church in Ireland, in view of the treatment to which, in regard both to conscience and property, those who had refused to accept the religious changes in Ireland—and they were the great majority—had been exposed; and that, without prejudice to his general principle of the duty of opposition to the appropriation by the State of the Church's property.

The measure of a life's worth taken by exclusive reference to its record of visible result, would be most inadequate. Thus regarded, Keble's achievements might seem sterile and disappointing; and yet the battle that he waged—for the recognition of the Church as the society of Divine foundation, following her own Divinely-ordered course, maintaining her doctrine, preserving her ritual, unaffected by

Parliament or Privy Council—has been in great part won.

The determination of the precise place to be assigned to Keble, as compared with the other chief partners in this movement, must largely rest on personal considerations ; and it is not therefore possible to expect agreement in what will always remain a matter of individual opinion. Nor, when the influence is so essentially reciprocal as it was between Keble and his friends, is such agreement necessary. To a nature so human, life-friendships, fostered by a rare sympathy and insight, were part of his very self. Unquestionably they helped to a great degree to modify his judgment upon men and things : but the influence, as the letters of those friends bear witness, was very far from being one-sided.

Along with the vindication of spiritual independence from secular claims has gone the vindication of the Church of England before the eyes of the rest of the Catholic world. Much has been done in this direction by giving the Church of England confidence in itself. The task remains, by loyalty to the principles which it professes, to extend that confidence to others, and with widening outlook to claim its rightful share in the work of reuniting Christendom.

To each generation time and circumstance offer peculiar problems, for the solution of which there is no golden rule. Keble, if in

these pages his character is rightly read, has left an example of encouragement. It is given to few to see the reward of their own work. The part that each man plays in the execution of the great scheme is fractional; but for those who persevere the reward is certain, and achievement frequently may follow on a scale for which the actors scarcely dared to hope.

“This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.”

INDEX TO NAMES OF PERSONS MENTIONED IN THE TEXT

- Arnold, Dr., 5, 24, 25, 30, 89.
Auckland, Lord (Bishop of Bath and Wells), 158.
Bagot, Bishop (Oxford), 43, 46, 47, 69, 158.
Barter, Rev. R. S., 214.
Bennett, Rev. W. J. E., 176.
Blomfield, Bishop (London), 126, 136, 155.
Bowden, J. W., 14, 113.
Burton, Dr., 36.
Carey, Bishop (Exeter), 20.
Church, Dean, 61, 80, 119.
Colenso, Bishop (Natal), 156, 206-210.
Coleridge, Sir J. T., 4, 6, 11, 14, 53, 65, 66, 70, 210, 214, 216, 217, 221.
Copeland, Rev. W. J., 123.
Copleston, Bishop (Llandaff), 14, 18.
Darnell, Rev. W. N., 6.
Denison, Archdeacon, 158-160, 168-170, 179.
Ditcher, Rev. J., 158, 169.
Dyson, Rev. C., 4, 19, 214.
Ellison, N., 4, 214.
Forbes, Bishop (Brechin), 170, 171, 173-175, 179.
Froude, Rev. R. H., 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 28, 30-32, 36, 43-45, 64, 113, 163, 194, 211.
Gladstone, W. E., 74, 77, 79, 147, 148, 186, 219, 233, 238.
Gorham, Rev. G. C., 128, 129, 131, 134, 137, 141, 142, 144, 151, 177, 178, 236.
Gray, Bishop (Capetown), 179, 205-210.
Grueber, Rev. C. S., 160.
Hampden, Bishop (Hereford), 34, 36, 37, 42, 71-73, 75, 125, 126, 137, 141, 142, 155, 223, 227.
Hawkins, Dr., 19.
Heathcote, Archdeacon, 18.
Heathcote, Sir W., 14, 18, 35, 180-182, 197, 221.

Heber, Bishop (Calcutta), 14.
Hinds, Bishop (Norwich),
127, 128.

Hook, Dr., 154, 188.

Hope-Scott, J. R., 177.

Howley, Archbishop, 32, 42,
67, 68, 125.

Jeune, Bishop, 164.

Jowett, Professor, 149, 150.

Keble, Sir H., 2.

Keble, Rev. J. (father), 3, 4,
15, 35, 98.

Keble, Mrs. (mother), 2, 15.

Keble, Rev. John, birth, 1792,
2; early training, 1, 3;
Scholar of Corpus Christi
College, 1806, 4; Degree,
1810, 8; Fellow of Oriel,
1811, *ib.*; gains English
and Latin Prize Essays,
1812, 9; Public Exam-
iner, 1814, *ib.*; Ordina-
tion, 1815, 12; Tutor
of Oriel, 1817, 13;
Curate of Southrop, 1823,
16; of Hursley, 1825,
18; of Coln S. Aldwyn's,
1826, *ib.*; candidature
for Provostship of Oriel,
1827, 19; Examiner to
India House, 1830-1,
20; Professor of Poetry,
1831, 21; preaches the
Assize Sermon on "Na-
tional Apostasy," 1833,
27; commencement of the

Oxford Movement, 30 ff.;
contributes to "Tracts for
the Times," 32 ff.; Vicar
of Hursley, 1835, 35; mar-
riage, *ib.*; edits Hooker's
Works, 1831-6, 38; Visi-
tation Sermon on Primi-
tive Tradition, 40; pub-
lishes a metrical version
of the Psalms, 1839, 42;
edits *Remains of R. H.*
Froude, 1838-9, 44; Ro-
man Question, 1839-45,
49 ff.; his treatise on
The Mysticism attributed to
the Early Fathers (Tract
89), 1841, 58 ff.; letters
on Tract xc, 64, 65;
protest in Mr. Young's
case, 1842, 67, 68; Jeru-
salem Bishopric, 68 ff.;
pamphlet, *Heads of Con-*
sideration in the Case of
Mr. Ward, 1845, 77;
letters to Newman, 1843-
5, 82-95; poetical works
—*The Christian Year*, 103-
109; *Lyra Innocentium*, 109
-113; *Miscellaneous Poems*,
113-117; protest against
Gorham case, 130-134;
"Church Matters in
1850," 137 ff.; the Mar-
riage Laws controversy,
1857, 144 ff.; the Deni-
son case, 158 ff.; treatise
on Eucharistic Adoration,
1857, 162-168; the

- Keble, Rev. John—*continued*.
 Brechin case, 1857-60,
 170-175; as parish priest,
 177 ff.; adviser of Bishop
 Gray of Capetown in
 Colenso troubles, 205 ff.;
 Life of Bishop Wilson,
 210 ff.; visit from Car-
 dinal Newman, 216 ff.;
 death, 221; personal ap-
 pearance, *ib.*; his private
 life, 227 ff.
 Keble, Mrs. (wife), 35, 91,
 92, 183, 215, 216, 219-
 221.
 Keble, Rev. T., 2, 7, 12, 47,
 68, 92, 93.
 Keble, Mrs. T., 36.
 Keble, Miss E., 2, 6, 214,
 215.
 Keble, Miss M. A., 3, 18.
 Keble, Miss S., 3, 10.
 Lampet, Miss, 183, 197, 198.
 Legge, Bishop (Oxford), 12.
 Liddon, Dr., 81.
 Lloyd, Bishop (Oxford), 26.
 Lockhart, Rev. W., 86.
 Lockhart, J. G., 99.
 Longley, Archbishop, 207.
 Manning, Cardinal, 45, 144,
 177, 236.
 Marriott, Rev. C., 214.
 Maule, Rev. J. (father-in-
 law), 2.
 Melbourne, Lord, 36.
 Miller, Rev. J., 5, 214.
 Milman, Bishop (Calcutta),
 21.
 Moberly, Bishop (Salisbury),
 44, 118, 127, 157, 174,
 202, 236.
 Monro, Rev. E., 186, 188.
 Mozley, Rev. J. B., 27, 75,
 119.
 Newman, Cardinal, 1, 14,
 19, 21, 22, 28, 30-33,
 36-38, 40, 42, 46, 47,
 49, 51-53, 55, 57, 58,
 61, 62, 64, 66-69, 80-
 82, 85-87, 90, 91, 94,
 95, 113, 119, 121, 122,
 142, 144, 152, 153, 181,
 192, 193, 216, 220, 236-
 238.
 Palmer, Rev. W., 26, 30, 31,
 76.
 Palmerston, Lord, 10.
 Peel, Sir R., 8, 20, 21.
 Phillpotts, Bishop (Exeter),
 128, 129, 131, 134, 135.
 Prevost, Sir G., 45.
 Pusey, Dr., 1, 5, 14, 20, 36,
 37, 41, 42, 46, 47, 54,
 58, 64, 66, 70, 73-76,
 78, 80, 86, 119-124,
 126, 131, 135, 136, 142,
 147, 150-156, 159-161,
 163, 169, 173, 174, 177,
 179, 188, 203, 216-219,
 229, 232, 237.
 Rose, Rev. H. J., 21, 25, 30.

- Russell, Lord J., 125.
- Scott, Sir W., 25, 70, 99, 102, 234.
- Sikes, Dr., 26.
- Southey, R., 14.
- Stanley, Dean, 224.
- Sumner, Archbishop, 158, 169.
- Sumner, Bishop (Winchester), 43, 67, 68, 126.
- Symons, Dr., 75.
- Tait, Archbishop, 150.
- Terrott, Bishop, 171.
- Thirlwall, Bishop (St. David's), 126.
- Tucker, Rev. J., 4.
- Ward, Rev. W. G., 45, 61, 77-79.
- Watson, J., 26.
- Wellington, Duke of, 21.
- Whately, Archbishop, 8, 21.
- White, Rev. B., 34.
- Wilberforce, Bishop (Oxford), 125, 154-157, 232.
- Wilberforce, Rev. R. L., 16, 17, 52, 142-144, 208.
- Williams, Rev. I., 16, 53, 69-71, 113, 178, 181.
- Wilson, Rev. R., 93, 228.
- Wiseman, Cardinal, 58, 61.
- Young, Rev. P., 67, 68, 232.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 817 075 5

